Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-245
Friday
22 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-245 *22 December 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Memorandum Signed on INF Control Provisions *[TASS]* 1
Grinevskiy Assesses Vienna Arms Reduction Talks *[TASS]* 1
U.S.-USSR Hold Consultations on Chemical Weapons *[TASS]* 2
Talks on Soviet Troop Withdrawal From Hungary *[Budapest MTI]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

USSR, Hungarian Officials Discuss Pact Unity *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Gives News Briefing 21 Dec 7
Soviet Position on Panama Events *[TASS]* 7
No Soviet Consent *[Moscow International]* 7
Results of Calfa Visit *[TASS]* 7
Soviet-Mongolian Talks in Moscow *[TASS]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Congress Briefed About New Moscow U.S. Embassy *[TASS]* 8

China

Further on PRC Drive To Combat Illegal Exits *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Dec]* 8
Conference Discusses RSFSR Ties With PRC *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 8

Northeast Asia

Mongolian Foreign Minister Arrives for Visit *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 9
Talks With Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 9
DPRK Proposals To Ease Tension Supported *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 11

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Lao Premier Kaysone Stops Over in Moscow *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 11
Vietnamese Party Delegation Visits USSR *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 11
Moscow Observer Hails New Phnom Penh Initiative *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* ... 11
Comparison on Gorbachev-Laos' Kaysone Meeting *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 12
Foreign Ministry Statement on Cambodia Comparison *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 12

Near East & South Asia

Western Anti-Iranian 'Propaganda' Noted *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 12
Moscow RPP Comments on Iran-Iraq Talks *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 13
Israel's Policy on Golan Heights Hit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Dec]* 13
Afghan State Security Preempts Coup Attempt *[PRAVDA 19 Dec]* 14
Syrian Defense Minister Arrives in Moscow 18 Dec *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Dec]* 15

East Europe

Soviet Media Report on Romanian Events 15
Ceausescu TV Address Raises Questions *[PRAVDA 22 Dec]* 15
Timisoara Workers Occupy Factories *[TASS]* 16
Fighting in Bucharest 21 Dec *[TASS]* 16
Official Denies Casualties *[TASS]* 16
Protesters Rally at Factories *[TASS]* 16
Demonstrations Grow 21 Dec *[TASS]* 17
Protesters Confront Security Forces *[TASS]* 17
21-22 Dec Night Scene Described *[TASS]* 17
22 Dec Morning 'Calm Situation' *[TASS]* 18
Shots Heard 22 Dec Morning *[TASS]* 18
Demonstrators Win Army Support *[TASS]* 18
Defense Minister Commits Suicide *[TASS]* 18
National Salvation Front Assumes Power *[Moscow International]* 18
Demonstrators Broadcast to Nation *[TASS]* 19
Protesters Occupy RCP CC Building *[TASS]* 19
Bucharest 'Controlled by People' *[TASS]* 19
General Calls for Ceausescu Arrest *[TASS]* 19
Hungary's Medgyessy, Nemeth Receive Gusev *[Budapest MTI]* 19
CPSU 'Cordial' Greetings to MSZMP Congress *[TASS]* 20
Poland's Walesa: Pluralistic Reforms Necessary *[TASS]* 20
Walesa's Call for Emergency Powers Viewed *[Runov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Dec]* 20
Communique on USSR Visit by CSSR's Calfa *[Prague CTK]* 21
Reportage on CPCZ Extraordinary Congress 21
First Day's Proceedings *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 21
Former Leaders Expelled *[TASS]* 22
Party Apologizes to Citizens *[Moscow TV]* 23
Congress Closes Without Party Split *[TASS]* 23
Congress Summarized *[PRAVDA 22 Dec]* 23
Gorbachev Greets New CPCZ Leaders *[PRAVDA 22 Dec]* 25
'Prague Spring' Figure Mlynar on USSR Visit *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 25
GDR, FRG Groups Propose Cooperation Conference *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 25
GDR, FRG Social Democratic Parties Meet *[IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 26
Albanian Amnesty for 20 Percent of Convicts *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 26
Yazov Greets Yugoslav Counterpart *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Dec]* 26

West Europe

Sweden To Expel Soviet Businessman for Spying *[Stockholm Radio]* 26
Shevardnadze UK, Belgian Visit Assessed *[TASS]* 27
Commentary on Soviet-EC Trade Agreement *[Balebanov on TASS]* 27
FRG Social Democrats Adopt New Program *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 28

Latin America & Caribbean

Akhromeyev Denies USSR Okayed Panama Attack *[Moscow International]* 28
Bessmertynkh Receives Envoy With Bush Statement *[TASS]* 28
Peace Committee Condemns U.S. Panama 'Invasion' *[TASS]* 29
TASS Reports Cheney TV Interview on Panama 29
Continuing Operations in Panama Reported *[TASS]* 29
Canal Reopens for Daytime Shipping *[TASS]* 30
Correspondents Killed, Wounded *[TASS]* 30
Nicaraguans Surround U.S. Embassy in Managua *[TASS]* 30
Commentary on U.S. Actions in Panama 30
TASS' Chigir on 'Aggression' *[TASS]* 30
Vladimir Chernyshev Commentary *[Moscow International]* 31
Vladislav Kozyakov Commentary *[Moscow International]* 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev 22 Dec Remarks on Romanian Developments *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Congress Issues Statement on Romania *[TASS]* 33
Gorbachev Remarks on Panama, Romania, Lithuania *[Moscow TV]* 33
Gorbachev Opens 21 Dec Congress Session *[Moscow TV]* 34
Further Gorbachev Speech *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Moscow TV Relays 21 Dec Congress Proceedings 35
1302 GMT 35
1349 GMT 36
1500 GMT 37
1540 GMT 37
1630 GMT 38
1810 GMT 39
1941 GMT 40
21 Dec Speeches at Congress of People's Deputies 40
Yuriy Kolmykov Remarks *[TASS]* 40
Yuriy Afanasayev *[Moscow TV]* 40
Vladimir Lopatin *[Moscow TV]* 42
TASS Reports 21 Dec Congressional Proceedings 43
Constitutional Compliance Bill 43
Debate on Bill 43
Constitutional Compliance Emphasized 43
Kirimov Submits Drafts 44
News Conference on Compliance Bill 45
Law on Deputies' Status Passes 45
'Status' Package Explained 45
Financial Declaration Proposed 46
Resolution on Economic Report 46
Urgent Issues Not on Agenda 47
21 Dec Congress Proceedings Reviewed *[TASS]* 47
Further on Proceedings *[TASS]* 48
Chernavin Interviewed on Concerns as Deputy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Dec]* 48
Legislation Panel Head Alekseyev Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Dec]* 50
Deputy Condemns Interregional Group Practices *[TASS]* 52
Yakovlev on Role as Deputy, Party Leader *[Moscow International]* 52
Conduct, Attitude of Deputies Discussed *[Plutnik in IZVESTIYA 16 Dec]* 53
Foreign Media View of Congress Assessed *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 53

Political & Social

Brazauskas Elected Lithuanian Party Leader *[Vilnius International]* 55
Further on Brazauskas *[TASS]* 55
21 Dec Lithuanian Congress Proceedings Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 56
1400 GMT 56
1508 GMT 56
1630 GMT 57
Lithuanian Congress Delegate Criticizes Plans *[TASS]* 58
Gorbachev Calls for Central Committee Plenum *[TASS]* 58
'Vremya' Views Lithuanian Party Changes *[Moscow TV]* 58
Vilnius Radio Carries 22 Dec Lithuanian Congress 59
0800 GMT 59
1050 GMT 59
1308 GMT 60
1323 GMT 60
Commission Report on Lithuanian Komsomol *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Nov]* 60
Army Paper Views Lithuanian Party Congress *[KRAZNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Dec]* 62
Latvian Electoral Commission Head Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 5 Oct]* 64
Estonia's Titma on Repeal of Article 6 *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 26 Nov]* 66

Estonian Democratic Labor Party Profiled *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 27 Oct]* 68
Ukraine Adopts Decision on Chernobyl Amelioration *[Kiev International]* 70
Patriarch Appeals to Gorbachev Over Atrocities *[Moscow International]* 70
Archbishop on Uniates' Attempt to Seize Cathedral *[TASS]* 70
Belorussian Party Leader Addresses Youth *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 4 Nov]* 70
Armenian SSR Procurator on NKAO Legal Status *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 21 Oct]* 75
NKAO Party Organizations To Join Armenian Party *[ARMENPRES]* 78
Armenian Local Soviets' Terms of Office Extended *[Yerevan Radio]* 79
Georgia Social Democratic Official Interviewed *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 2 Nov]* 79
Article on Crime Rate, Presumption of Innocence
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Dec] 84
KGB Apprehends Donetsk Racketeers *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 17 Nov]* 85
Serious Crime Increasing in Belorussian SSR *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 17 Nov]* 85
Campaign Against Organized Crime Discussed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 50]* 86
Gorbachev, Other Leaders Sign Mazurov Obituary *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 87
Funeral Commission Announced *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 87
Leningrad Communists' Election Plans Discussed *[PRAVDA 20 Dec]* 87
Glavlit Chief Discusses Draft Press Law *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 45]* 89
Restoration of Exiles' Citizenship Urged *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* 91
Yevgeniy Ambartsumov Writes on Sakharov's Death *[Milan L'UNITA 18 Dec]* 92

Memorandum Signed on INF Control Provisions

LD2112220489 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Geneva December 22 TASS—The 6th session of the Special Control Commission established in compliance with the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, ended its work in Geneva on Thursday.

At the end of its work, Soviet and American representatives signed a memorandum of understanding concerning the use of control provisions in the INF Treaty.

The INF Treaty, which came into force on June 1, 1988, made it incumbent on the Soviet Union and the United States to destroy all intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The treaty established the comprehensive control regime which includes provisions on several types of on-site inspections.

The memorandum on control signed at this session determined procedures and equipment to implement treaty provisions concerning on-site inspections.

The special control commission which agreed [upon] the memorandum on control was established in compliance with the INF treaty to promote the efficient implementation of treaty provisions.

The INF Treaty tackles the task of destroying the whole class of Soviet and U.S. missiles under the conditions of strict control. The signing of the memorandum on control is an important step towards the implementation of the treaty.

Grinevskiy Assesses Vienna Arms Reduction Talks

LD2112212489 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Vienna December 21 TASS—Can an agreement on the reduction of forces and conventional armaments in Europe be drafted by next year and signed at the summit level? Leaders of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO have declared more than once that the two military-poltiical alliances are striving for this.

The question crops up when one surveys the ground covered at the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, the fourth round of which ended in Vienna today. Among positive aspects of the past round, both sides submitted their drafts of a treaty on conventional armaments in Europe. Progress has been made in coordinating a number of preliminary texts regarding the exchange of information and verification.

This is all that has been achieved so far. Back in October the Warsaw Treaty countries made a number of important proposals on aviation, verification, information exchange, and stabilisation measures in order to help achieve agreement on critical directions.

These proposals have received no response.

NATO countries are not concentrating on negotiations with the Warsaw Treaty countries, having become preoccupied with coordinating positions among themselves, head of the Soviet delegation, ambassador at large Oleg Grinevskiy told a news conference here today.

He said that working groups have been unable to produce any definitions, although both sides noted that there are real opportunities to agree on the definitions of tanks, armoured combat vehicles and helicopters.

In general, the situation at the talks is causing concern, he noted.

Late in September the delegations of the Warsaw Treaty countries made new proposals on reductions of combat aircraft of the front (tactical) aviation and on setting limits to fighter-interceptors of anti-aircraft defence.

These proposals were designed to alleviate concern among NATO countries that the talks did not cover anti-aircraft defence planes.

These proposals have also received no response. It took NATO countries five months to work out definitions of tanks and armoured combat vehicles. In mid-December they finally advanced proposals that confirm that there stand on tanks has opened a dangerous channel for the continuation of the arms race.

NATO proposals do not cover light tanks and combat vehicles with heavy armaments, opening the opportunity for their build up.

The state of affairs in arms reduction remains complicated, Grinevskiy told TASS.

"We propose to reduce not only armaments but also personnel, which would be an important factor of stability in the present-day European situation," he said.

"The United States and other NATO countries are against this, but they have not provided a logical explanation," he noted.

"For instance, in regard to the reduction of forces stationed outside national territories in Europe, the West insists that reductions be applied only to forces of the Soviet Union and the United States. We are not against this, but we simultaneously propose the reduction of British, French, Belgian, Dutch and Canadian troops stationed in West Germany. Numerical strength of these troops is quite large—160 thousand men, or, according to NATO standards, ten divisions," Grinevskiy noted.

"Why should these troops have a privileged status, giving unilateral advantage to the West? Much work remains to be done, before an agreement on conventional armaments in Europe can be signed in 1990," Grinevskiy said.

U.S.-USSR Hold Consultations on Chemical Weapons

LD2112235289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Paris, 21 Dec (TASS)—On 18 and 19 December, routine rounds of the Soviet-U.S. consultations on the nonproliferation of chemical weapons and on the nonproliferation of missiles and missile technology were held. The Soviet delegation was headed by V.P. Karpov, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister, and E. Verville.

Talks on Soviet Troop Withdrawal From Hungary

LD2112233489 Budapest MTI in English 1855 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest, December 21 (MTI)—Continuing the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, a decision has been reached on withdrawing a tactical missile brigade, a fighter bomber air wing, a mechanized rifle regiment, two armoured car battalions, and two construction troops [as received] from Hungary in 1990. In accordance with the troop withdrawal agreement announced at the beginning of the year, an assault battalion will also be withdrawn from the area of Hungary. This was announced by Minister of Defence Ferenc Karpati on Thursday in Budapest. At the joint session of parliament's foreign affairs and defence committees, held after the December session of the National Assembly ended.

Retired Brigadier General Janos Sebok reiterated his proposal, under which parliament should authorize the government to hold talks with the Soviet Government on fully withdrawing Soviet troops temporarily stationed in Hungary by December 31, 1990. Justifying the motion, Mr Sebok said no military or political reasons exist for the stationing of Soviet troops in Hungary, therefore withdrawal cannot depend on the development of the Vienna arms reduction talks.

Mr Karpati reconfirmed that neither political nor military reasons exist for the stationing of Soviet troops in Hungary. However, he stressed the troop withdrawals affect European stability, therefore these can be scheduled depending on the results of the Vienna talks.

As the session did not have a quorum, MPS [members of parliament—fbis] position of the committees on Mr Sebok's motion at another session, in early January.

USSR, Hungarian Officials Discuss Pact Unity

PM2112134589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 p 3

[Feature under general "Prognosis" rubric: "Warsaw Pact: To Be or Not To Be?" comprised of S. Butkov interview with V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister and chief of the Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament Administration; and A. Kaverznev interview with Istvan Oszi, Hungarian deputy foreign minister; dates of interviews not given—first two paragraphs are KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] "The Unity of the Warsaw Pact Is Beginning to Crumble. Hungary and Poland Are Trying to Establish Contact with the West at the Vienna Talks on Conventional Forces in Europe"—an article under this headline was carried in a recent issue of the West German newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU. The article said in part: "There are more and more signs that the states of the Warsaw Pact are no longer speaking with one voice. An official U.S. spokesman stated at a session of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that the Polish and Hungarian delegations in Vienna have established contact with U.S. representatives to express their views on certain questions." "The Hungarians are insisting on the complete withdrawal from their country of all Soviet troops, to be enshrined in a treaty. Poland demands a reduction of Soviet forces stationed on its territory, which is to be recorded in an official document."

So what is happening to the Warsaw Pact? We have asked our correspondents in Moscow and Budapest to find the answer to Hamlet's question featured in the headline.

Moscow

[Butkov] In order to obtain first-hand information, so to speak, I addressed myself to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On a Saturday morning your KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent was received by V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister and chief of the Problems of Arms Limitation and Disarmament Administration. The team of diplomats which he heads has the most direct bearing on the Vienna talks. The West German newspaper report provided the kickoff for this interview.

Western press reports about the Warsaw Pact are sometimes highly contradictory. It would probably be wrong to confine our conversation merely to an analysis of these reports. But nonetheless, the question involuntarily arises: In the past we learned from newspaper articles what difficulties NATO countries sometimes experience in reaching a consensus. As for the Warsaw Pact, the impression was created that such problems are unknown to us, that our positions are elaborated in complete unanimity. However, evidently, the processes of democratization and the development of glasnost which are under way today in a number of socialist states have brought about changes in this sphere, too?

[Karpov] Naturally, you must not imagine the Warsaw Pact as some kind of ossified mechanism. Changes are taking place here, too. New organs have been established whose task it is to analyze different viewpoints very closely and take them into account. We do not take the view that there must be complete unanimity between Warsaw Pact countries on all questions. The world is not monochrome. Different nuances exist, so to speak. It cannot be said today that the positions occupied by the bloc are based on one-sided decisions taken by the USSR and accepted by the other countries by acclamation. These times are past and there is no returning to them. Last year a special commission on disarmament was set up which elaborates the common stances at the talks, including the Vienna talks.

What proposals are being put forward by Poland, for instance? There is the "Jaruzelski Plan." It was "honed" in close cooperation with the other Warsaw Pact countries. What is the essence of this idea? It is the creation of a zone of reduced military confrontation and enhanced cooperation in Central Europe. The "Jaruzelski Plan" makes provision for the elimination of nuclear weapons along the dividing line between the Warsaw Pact and NATO and for confidence-building measures such as notification, exchange of information, inspections, and so forth. Also for political cooperation, that is the development of the most diverse ties between the two alliances. This is the Polish position and we support it.

There are also other options which are currently being discussed at the Vienna talks. Up to a point, they incorporate both the Jaruzelski idea and the proposals of other Warsaw Pact states. For instance the "Jakes Plan." The latter is more political than military in character and makes provision for cooperation between Czechoslovakia and its neighbors—the FRG and Austria. It also envisages the creation of zones of reduced tension.

Generally speaking, the most diverse plans are being analyzed and are finding expression in the common platform.

In the course of the talks additional proposals may come up, of course. Hungary, for instance, has recently put forward the idea of exchanging armament information, information on tanks to be specific, with NATO countries. It embarked on the implementation of this program without waiting for agreement to be reached in negotiations. The British side also expressed an interest in the implementation of this plan without, however, taking a similar step.

The Hungarian initiative is within the mainstream of the Vienna talks. It has focused public attention on the need for a broader exchange of information between the two alliances, and ultimately it contributed to shared success. It is beyond doubt that these kinds of facts cannot be described as evidence of disorder and vacillation within the Warsaw Pact. All sorts of other contacts between

representatives of the two blocs' member countries are also working in favor of the common cause.

Naturally, it cannot be ignored the the Warsaw Pact states are beset by many domestic and economic problems of their own. Hungary and Poland, for instance. To a lesser extent, Czechoslovakia. You are aware of the processes currently under way in the GDR. The course toward renewal which these countries have embarked upon has, of course, affected their activities in the military sphere, too. For instance, our Hungarian colleagues are very interested in ensuring that the accord in Vienna on the reduction of arms and armed forces in Europe applies to a considerable extent to their country. They want to participate actively in this process so as to ensure that the primary reductions extend to Hungary, too. Poland is also currently discussing the reduction of its arms expenditure and wants to make its contribution to the elaboration of the accords. These are understandable and normal tendencies.

[Butkov] Reports have appeared in the Western press about Polish and Hungarian demands for reductions of Soviet troops stationed on the territory of their countries.

[Karpov] In Poland we have a minimal number of troops. It is being further reduced within the framework of the USSR initiative to reduce its armed forces by 500,000 men. The Polish Government has not raised the question of further cuts.

Hungary, on the other hand, has put forward a new initiative proposing that a demilitarized zone be created along the borders with Yugoslavia and Austria and has asked us to redeploy Soviet tank units stationed in this zone deeper inside the country. This request was met.

We cannot but welcome proposals to create demilitarized zones. Our country is in favor of the creation of a zone along the border between the GDR and the FRG which would contain a reduced quantity of offensive arms and from which tanks, missile installations, and aviation systems would be removed. That is, those arms which could be used to stage a surprise attack.

[Butkov] Some politicians in Hungary have been heard to advocate the withdrawal of their country from the Warsaw Pact.

[Karpov] We have received official assurances from the Hungarian Government that it does not have the least intention of changing its stance in respect of the Warsaw Pact. The same applies to Poland. The Polish Government has assured us that it will maintain a loyal attitude toward the Warsaw Pact and that it is interested it maintaining its membership in it. We have no doubt that this really is so.

At the latest Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee session which was held in the Polish capital, the Polish minister of foreign affairs spoke about the need for cooperation within the framework of the alliance. It is true though, that the Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze found it somewhat strange to have to use "Mr" instead of "Comrade" when addressing his Polish colleague.

[Butkov] The fourth round of the Vienna talks has opened recently. What is the state of affairs?

[Karpov] Great changes have taken place at the Vienna talks. If, a few years ago, someone had told me that we will achieve such success, I would not have believed him. After agreeing on the mandate of the talks, it became obvious that both sides are ready not only to discuss the questions, but also to resolve them. At the moment no one is trying to drag out the joint work as was the case with the previous Vienna talks which got bogged down at the very outset and dragged on for more than 15 years. Going by what has been achieved in the first three rounds, it is possible to hope that total agreement will be reached by the end of next year.

[Butkov] So let us imagine that the document has been signed. What effect can be expected from the implementation of the program enshrined in it?

[Karpov] Yes, let's imagine what would be the effect of reducing 60,000 tanks to 20,000 tanks with either of the sides not being allowed to have more than that? And not more than 22,000 artillery pieces, 28,000 armored personnel carriers, and 4,700 aircraft. The implementation of such a program will entail not only the reduction of arms but also a restructuring of the entire system of NATO and Warsaw Pact Armed Forces. They will have a more clearly pronounced defensive character.

[Butkov] Along with reducing their arms, NATO countries are modernizing them. Do similar programs exist on our side?

[Karpov] It depends what you mean by "modernization." If it is a question of replacing a small missile with a range of 120 km, for instance, by a new missile which is 5 or 10 times more powerful and has a range of 480 km, as NATO is planning, then I cannot bring myself to describe such steps as an "upgrading" [usovershenstvovaniye]. Old arsenals are being replaced by new types and varieties of arms.

What are we doing in this respect? We still have T-34 tanks in our arsenal, for instance, which date back to the Great Patriotic War. They are being eliminated as part of the cuts. We also have tanks of another type which are also obsolete, the T-55 tanks. They are being replaced by T-80 tanks. This machine is, of course, much more sophisticated, but not fundamentally new. What is new on the tank is the improved gun and sighting device, its armor is more reliable, and it has improved maneuverability. This is the sort of program that I describe as modernization. [Karpov ends]

Budapest

[Kaverznev] There will be no more party organizations at Hungarian enteprises and institutions. A decision of the parliament to this effect has been backed up by the results of a nationwide referendum. "Comrade" as the customary form of address is disappearing from the official vocabulary.

How am I to address you—"Mr" or "Comrade," was my first question to Istvan Oszi, the Hungarian deputy foreign minister.

[Oszi] "Comrade" if you like, he smiled.

[Kaverznev] In that case, Comrade Oszi, there has been much talk in the West of late about differences within the Warsaw Pact. In your opinion, is it really a question of serious contradictions?

[Oszi] Any topic must be approached from realistic positions. Realistic, in the sense that security and cooperation in the world can be built only on the basis of a balance of forces. One of the elements of this balance is the Warsaw Pact. We also believe that the Warsaw Pact could be disbanded, but only on condition that our security is guaranteed at lower troop and armament levels and the other military alliance—NATO—is disbanded at the same time. These are our two points of departure, from which several conclusions can be drawn in the light of the laws of classical logic.

First, we must seek to preserve the balance in the world. This does not only not preclude intensive political and economic cooperation and troop and armament reduction, but makes it even more essential. Second, we must create a situation in which it will be actually possible to place the question of the simultaneous disbandment of the two military-political alliances on the agenda. Obviously, this will not come about automatically, but will demand very purposeful and persistent efforts.

As for the situation within the Warsaw Pact, we can see that on fundamental questions, such as the preservation of a balance, and the striving to reduce troops and armaments there are no differences in the member-countries' positions. At the same time, quite naturally, different viewpoints on individual questions exist within the organization, depending on the situation in the respective countries, their geopolitical and strategic location, and also as a result of the fact that the renewal of socialism is proceeding at a different pace in different countries. I would add, that ideological differences between them are also manifesting themselves: Relatively big differences at that.

The question arises: Does this sort of situation not hamper the organization's efficient operation? I believe that basically, it is not an obstacle. At the same time, however, it is preventing us from making real progress in the renewal of the Warsaw Pact both in the military sphere and in improving political cooperation. In recent years energetic efforts on the part of certain member-countries have been in evidence to expand the sphere of the Warsaw Pact's activities, to turn the organization into an arena for exchanging information on socialist building. Quite apart from all kind of coordination efforts on purely internal questions. We have a definite opinion in this respect: The framework of the Warsaw Pact's activities must not be expanded in this manner.

[Kaverznev] How is the situation within the Warsaw Pact being assessed in Hungary? The age of seeming unanimity has come to an end, certain opposition organizations are raising demands for a neutral Hungary, and for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from its territory....

[Oszi] Attitudes toward the USSR in the Hungarian society are ambivalent as a result of specific historical circumstances. We do not regard it as expedient to link two different questions—relations with the USSR, and the Warsaw Pact. If only for the reason that Hungarian-Russian relations did not begin with the Warsaw Pact. No doubt that at some point in the future membership in the Warsaw Pact will cease to be of strategic interest for Hungary. On the other hand, multifaceted, fruitful contacts with the USSR must keep developing. This is a question which goes beyond the framework of the Warsaw Treaty. I cannot imagine the development of Hungary and its political stability without cooperation with the USSR. I am sure that serious politicians cannot be interested in bad relations with the Soviet Union. It is in Hungary's interests to make use of the potential inherent in neighborly relations and cooperation with a world power in the political, economic, and other spheres.

As for the future of the Warsaw Treaty, different opinions, naturally, prevail in the Hungarian society. Some of them, specifically the ideas of neutrality, have historical roots. Back during the period between the two world wars certain representatives of Hungarian social thought saw the future of Hungary in a third option of development between East and West. Thus the roots are there and the illusion persists: Many people in Hungary are convinced that it is possible to attain and declare neutrality unilaterally. They do not realize that neutrality is not based on someone's desire, but above all on the correlation of forces in the world and the state of international relations as a whole. A section of the Hungarian society believes that the country's further development will result in some form of neutrality. My experience tells me something quite different. A closer look at the main trends of international development reveals clearly that they lead to closer cooperation and integration. A graphic example of this is provided by Austria. It is a neutral state but it sees its future and its economic development only in conjunction with the EEC. At the same time Austria is also very actively seeking cooperation with East European states. So that in this light I do not regard Hungarian neutrality as a realistic proposition.

[Kaverznev] A Soviet military airfield located on the outskirts of Debrecen has evoked protests, and in my opinion justified protests, from the city's inhabitants. They are demanding that the flights be stopped by the end of 1990. A parliamentary subcommission has visited Debrecen to study the situation, but no conclusions have been drawn so far. In your opinion, is a compromise solution possible?

[Oszi] I believe that this question concerns the presence of Soviet troops on Hungarian territory in general. The population is given very little information about what the presence of Soviet forces means for Hungary, what their international functions are, what would happen if these troops were withdrawn, and so forth. We view this question realistically within the context of the correlation of forces, and especially Armed Forces in Central Europe, and we are confident that it is possible to hope for an earlier withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian territory. I believe that if agreement is reached at the Vienna talks on conventional arms, this question too will be discussed in concrete terms.

What the population does not like are the problems created by the noise and accidents, and the bills that do not get paid on time. I know that our military organs are attending to the essence of these questions. On the basis of glasnost they need to cooperate more resolutely and consistently with a view to resolving them. It is obvious that the Soviet side could take steps to eliminate the causes of dissatisfaction. The Soviet military unit stationed at Tokol is setting a good example of how mutual relations with the local population should be developed. I believe that in Debrecen, too, a solution will be found.

[Kaverznev] What, in the view of the Hungarian Government, should the Warsaw Pact be like?

[Oszi] Our main demand on the Warsaw Pact is that it should act with initiative from the positions of the new political thinking in key international processes. We realize that Hungary's membership in the Warsaw Pact enhances its chances of participating in international politics. We will be able to truly avail ourselves of this opportunity if the Warsaw Pact continues to act vigorously, purposefully, and in the interests of disarmament.

It seems to me that this question could be viewed also in a narrower sense. We who work in this organization would like to see it being much more flexible, less bureaucratic and rigid, and offering an opportunity for a freer exchange of opinions. We would like Warsaw Pact documents to be less bulky and written in a less cumbersome style. The Warsaw Pact must adapt to the accelerated political processes and create an organizational framework which will enable it to react very promptly and at a high level to the changes which are taking place, and to elaborate its appraisals.

I believe that we must pursue similar aims also in the question of military cooperation, although here it is a question of an organization of a completely different type. The state of military cooperation in the future will depend largely on East-West relations and on the progress of the disarmament process.

Perfilyev Gives News Briefing 21 Dec

Soviet Position on Panama Events

LD2112173289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1630 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Dec (TASS)—"The intervention undertaken by Washington against an independent state is an open violation of the fundamental principles of the UN Charter and of the norms of mutual relations between states." At a briefing, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, picked this clause out of the Soviet Government statement given out today on the subject of the U.S. armed intervention in the affairs of Panama.

The USSR, the Foreign Ministry spokesman noted, has placed its stake on the search for the political settlement of international conflicts and the condemnation of the use of force and dictate in international affairs. Such a policy is meeting with growing support and approval in the world. The action against Panama, he pointed out, shows that "somebody is trying to hinder the affirmation of the above-mentioned policy in international affairs."

Answering a question on whether the Soviet side was informed beforehand by the United States about its action against Panama, Vadim Pefilyev said that "there were no preliminary contacts between the USSR leadership and the United States."

To the question on what actions the USSR has taken in connection with this U.S. action, the Foreign Ministry spokesman reported that the Soviet point of view was made known to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow on 20 December, and it has also been expressed at the USSR Congress People's Deputies and in today's Soviet Government announcement. "The U.S. action has met with wide condemnation at the Security Council session, specially convened in this connection, during which the Soviet representative subjected the U.S. action to argued criticism," he said. "As we understand it, the Council's session will be continued."

Answering a question on how such an action concurs with the results of the Malta meeting and the general development Soviet-U.S. relations, Vadim Pewrfilyev announced that "of course, it does not help to improve relations."

No Soviet Consent

LD2112115389 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Excerpts] The Soviet government has urged the United States Administration to end interventionist actions with regard to sovereign Panama. [passage omitted on Soviet statement] Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev has discarded as false Western media reports that the United States action against Panama had been committed with the Soviet consent obtained at the meeting in Malta. Neither in Malta nor in any other place could the Soviet Union agree to such an action, Vadim Perfilyev said. [passage omitted on Malta talks]

Results of Calfa Visit

LD2112172289 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—The brief working visit to Moscow on Wednesday by Marian Calfa, head of the Czechoslovak Government, enabled the leaders of the two countries to compare notes—in the light of major changes in the Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic—on their approach towards matters of principle in Soviet-Czechoslovak relations and create prerequisites for their further development, Soviet Foreign Ministry [Spokesman] Vadim Perfilyev told a press briefing here today.

The Soviet spokesman recalled that Calfa met Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and had talks with Prime Minister Ryzhkov that focused on the political, economic and social development of the two countries, on prospects for bilateral cooperation and on key international issues.

The sides agreed to begin talks on Soviet troops stationed in Czechoslovakia in the first half of January 1990, Perfilyev said. The sides also agreed that problems relating to the events of 1968 require careful study by historians.

Soviet-Mongolian Talks in Moscow

LD2112171489 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today described as "an essential link in the intensive dialogue that characterises Soviet-Mongolian relations" the current talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Mongolian counterpart Tserenpiliin Gombosuren, in Moscow on a working visit.

Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told journalists at a briefing here today that the sides focused on various aspects of Soviet-Mongolian interaction, the foreign-policy activity of the two states and key international problems.

Shevardnadze and Gombosuren gave special attention to perfecting the mechanism of bilateral economic cooperation, including its political aspects.

They also pointed to the need to further coordinate the activity of the foreign ministries in the two countries and the development of regular contacts between them.

The ministers signed an agreement on establishing a Mongolian cultural and information centre in Moscow.

In the opinion of the two sides, the current talks will give a fresh impetus to cooperation and fraternal friendship between the Soviet Union and Mongolia.

United States & Canada

Congress Briefed About New Moscow U.S. Embassy

LD2112223589 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 21 TASS —By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash:

United States Secretary of State James Baker notified Congress on Wednesday that the U.S. Administration decided that the U.S. Embassy under construction in Moscow will be torn down and a new one will be erected in its place.

This recommendation, the ASSOCIATED PRESS reports, was based on U.S. Intelligence conclusions that "sophisticated listening devices were implanted" in the nearly complete 8-story building. Intelligence services insisted it be pulled down.

Baker informed Congressmen Olympia Snowe of Maine, a ranking right-wing republican party member who inspected the embassy building in 1987 and demanded its demolition, that the new building would be bug-proof and built in close cooperation with intelligence services, Kirk Walder, Snowe's official spokesman, told journalists.

Conservative U.S. Congressmen, special services and representatives of right-wing organisations have raised a ruckus over several past years about the security of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

Although the Soviet side denied these claims, both houses of the U.S. Congress repeatedly passed different resolutions and bills interfering with the intergovernment agreements to build new American and Soviet Embassies in Moscow and Washington. They even called for their abrogation.

Local press reports indicate that congressmen regard the "embassy problem: as a sure way to make political capital.

The latest action of the U.S. Administration will drag out the commissioning of new embassy buildings in Moscow and Washington for years. Official U.S. State Department spokesmen have admitted that the process will "obviously take years" to be accomplished.

They stressed that the United States will not allow the Soviet Union to use its new building in Washington until the U.S. Embassy staff moves into the reconstructed building in Moscow.

THE WASHINGTON POST reported that the new U.S. Embassy building in Moscow will cost the American taxpayers 300 million dollars.

China

Further on PRC Drive To Combat Illegal Exits

PM2012124189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under the general rubric "Border Regime Tightened Up": "PRC: Under Strict Surveillance"]

[Text] China has tightened up border surveillance to prevent illegal exit from the country using fake passports and other documents.

A spokesman for the PRC Ministry of Public Security told journalists that a special package of measures has been elaborated to improve Chinese border guards' professional training and exit procedures; it is also planned "to step up the search for and exposure of illegal elements engaged in organizing illegal exit from the country."

Over the last few years, he said, more and more Chinese have gone to foreign countries in accordance with prescribed procedures. In the last 4 years almost 500,000 PRC citizens have received permission to travel abroad on personal business and in the first 10 months of this year almost 100,000 such requests were satisfied.

Nevertheless some people who failed to receive exit documents for various reasons are endeavoring to leave the country by illegal means, the ministry spokesman noted. This year more than 400 such attempts have been suppressed.

Conference Discusses RSFSR Ties With PRC

PM2112130589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition p16

[V. Ganshin report: "Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Ties With China"]

[Text] A science and practice conference, "Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Ties With the PRC: Possibilities and Prospects," has been held in Moscow. V.M. Vinogradov, RSFSR foreign minister, delivered a report. M.L. Titarenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Institute, talked about the prospects and possibilities for economic cooperation.

The speakers at the conference said that, since the summit meeting, a very favorable situation has taken shape for the development of economic, scientific and technical, cultural, and other ties between the Soviet Union and the PRC. Border contacts between the three provinces of northeastern China, on the one hand, and the krays and oblasts of the Soviet Far East and Siberia, on the other, are becoming particularly important.

The representatives of many Soviet and economic bodies cited numerous examples of successful cooperation not only with respect to trade links but also in setting up joint enterprises, developing tourism, and implementing

exchanges between the border regions' social and youth organizations. At the same time, a general theme running through the speeches was that existing potential—primarily on the Soviet side—is not being sufficiently exploited. The obstacles are shortcomings in the legal basis of economic cooperation, the limited nature of Soviet funds, and poor development of the information base. The shortage of cadres with experience of commercial activity in the new conditions is also having an effect.

In view of the proposals made at the conference, its participants unanimously concluded that, while retaining local bodies' independence in questions of economic cooperation, there is a real need to create a unified coordination center attached to the RSFSR government.

Northeast Asia

Mongolian Foreign Minister Arrives for Visit

PM2112120589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Ts. Gombosuren, Mongolian foreign minister, arrived in Moscow 20 December for a working visit at the Soviet Government's invitation.

He was greeted at the airport by V.M. Nikiforov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

The welcoming party included V.I. Sitnikov, USSR ambassador to Mongolia, and Ts. Gurbadam, Mongolian ambassador to the USSR.

Talks With Shevardnadze

LD2112210889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1820 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Dec (TASS)—Today talks took place between E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Ts. Gombosuren, candidate member of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee and Mongolia's People's Republic [MPR] minister of foreign affairs, who is in Moscow on a working visit. The discussion centered on questions of Soviet-Mongolian relations and a wide range of topical international problems. The ministers signed an agreement between the USSR Government and the MPR Government on the creation of an MPR information and cultural center in Moscow, and its activities. During the visit a plan of cooperation between the two countries' foreign ministries for 1990-1991 was signed.

Shevardnadze informed the MPR foreign minister of the major events in the political and economic life of the Soviet state. He spoke of the progress of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies, stressing the importance, as a landmark, of this forum for further implementing the ideas of perestroyka and accelerating the processes of democratization and glasnost in the USSR.

In this connection Ts. Gombosuren stated that in the MPR the restructuring processes in the USSR are being followed with interest and the CPSU's course of accelerating the political and economic transforamtions is supported. He spoke of the creative work of renewal in all spheres of life in Mongolian society, of the results of the recent Seventh MPRP Central Committee Plenum and the session of the People's Great Hural, which marked out fresh frontiers of reforms.

Soviet people, E.A. Shevardnadze announced, show profound attention and interest in the way the tasks of perestroyka and renewal are being solved in fraternal Mongolian in accordance with the specific national character of the country.

The importance of the steadfast development of relations of fraternal friendship and cooperation between the USSR and MPR, which are based on principles of socialist internationalism, has been confirmed. Close interaction between the CPSU and the MPRP is a determining factor for these relations.

The sides stressed the fundamental importance of the meeting in July 1989 between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USR Supreme Soviet, and J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the MPR People's Great Hural, for further deepening and perfecting Soviet-Mongolian cooperation, and the development of multifaceted relations between the CPSU and the MPRP, between the CPSU and the MPRP, between the two countries and peoples on the sound foundation of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid.

Great attention was focused at the talks on the state of and measures to perfect economic cooperation between the USSR and the MPR, including its political aspects. Noting the existence of great opportunities for raising the effectiveness of economic mutual relations, the ministers agreed that what is needed is a substantial adjustment of the structure of cooperating and a restructuring of its mechanism, taking into account mutual interests.

The ministers came out in favor of openness and glasnost as the constant norm of Soviet-Mongolian contacts in all fields.

An accord was reached that the two countries' foreign ministries will begin joint work on studying archive materials on Soviet-Mongolian relations which are being kept in the USSR foreign policy archive.

The sides noted the topicality of working out problems of ecology both along the lines of bilateral interaction and

on a world scale. A Soviet-Mongolian agreement on cooperation in the field of nature conservancy will be of significant importance.

During discussion of foreign policy issues the sides noted that positive shifts on the world arena are convincing evidence of the ever more palpable influence of new political thinking on the improvement of the international climate and the reinforcement of universal peace and security. The ministers noted with satisfaction that the newly-emerged turn toward overcoming confrontation has created the conditions for a qualitatively new peaceful stage of stable and predictable international development.

The Mongolian leadership, Ts. Gombosuren announced, highly appraises the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush on Malta as giving a new serious impulses to the halting of the 'cold war', and to the continuation of the military and political detente between the East and West.

During the talks E.A. Shevardnadze and Ts. Gombosuren confirmed their support for the United Nations as an irreplaceable instrument for maintaining and strengthening universal peace and security, and they spoke in favor of the further affirmation in the practice of international relations of the just and democratic principles on which the United Nations is founded.

The ministers appraised highly the role of the Nonaligned Movement on the world arena as a powerful and influential force in the struggle by mankind to lessen international tension and for a just world order.

The Soviet side came out in favor of support for the MPR's foreign policy efforts. In this context, Mongolia's receiving the status of observer in the Nonaligned Movement, its entry into the "Group of '77" and also the MPR's steps to activate mutually advantageous cooperation with highly developed countries were noted with satisfaction.

The participants in the talks discussed thoroughly the situation in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region. Recently, it has been changing for the better. Discussions aimed at searching for ways to strengthen the stability and security of this region have become more animated. Antinuclear sentiments are growing stronger here and there is a growing desire for the rejection of the continuation of military and political confrontation.

In this context the ministers note that the joint decision on the withdrawal of 75% of Soviet troops from Mongolia demonstrates the goodwill of the two states and will promote a strengthening of an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding in the Asian-Pacific region. The question regarding the remaining part of the contingent of Soviet troops was discussed. Their complete withdrawal must be an element of a general process of lowering the level of military confrontation in this region.

Ts. Gombosuren gave information on the work being conducted by Mongolian diplomats to implement the MPR'S new foreign policy initiative regarding the formation in the northeast part of the Asian-Pacific region of a permanently operating mechanism for political dialogue and cooperation. The Soviet side noted the topical and constructive character of this proposal by the MPR.

The MPR foreign minister expressed the hope that it will meet with a positive response in the capitals of other interested states.

During discussion of the conflict situations in various regions of the world the ministers indicated the necessity of their political solution by means of negotiations, on the basis of a balance of interests and respect for the rights of each people to the choice of its own path of development. The absolute exclusion of interference in the affairs of other states and the use of force in any form is demanded.

The conviction was expressed that the quickest possible achievement of a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian problem by political means would constitute an important contribution to the cause of peace in Southeast Asia. This would be greatly facilitated by the introduction of a moratorium on military deliveries from otuside to all the Cambodian sides and the continuation of the negotiation process on Cambodia at all levels.

The lessening of tension on the Korean peninsula and the development of a peace dialogue between North and South Korea, in the ministers' opinions, would correspond to the interests of all the region's states. The USSR and Mongolia support the DPRK's proposal on totally freeing the Korean peninsula from nuclear weapons.

Ts. Gombosuren noted the beneficial influence on the general climate in the Asiatic-Pacific region of the normalization of relations between the USSR and China. The USSR and Mongolia will make the necessary efforts to consistently develop the many links with the PRC on the principles of equality and goodneighborliness with the aims of mutual enrichment with the experience of building socialism and joint solving of problems of security and cooperation in the Asiatic-Pacific region, without, of course, at the same time damaging the interests of third countries.

Both sides acknowledged that the talks that took place and passed in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely mutual understanding were highly useful and expressed confidence that their results will serve the cause of further developing Soviet-Mongolian relations in various spheres, including cooperation and mutual assistance in international matters.

On behalf of the MPRP Central Committee and the MPR Government Ts. Gombosuren invited E.A. Shevardnadze to pay a friendly visit to the MPR. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

DPRK Proposals To Ease Tension Supported

SK2212072389 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Major General Choe Ui-ung, senior member of the Korean-Chinese side of the Korean Armistice Commission, has lodged a protest against the U.S. side and demanded an immediate halt to the U.S. military buildup in the southern half of the Korean peninsula. In this connection, our station commentator Aleksey Nikolayev says: The problem is that the United States has brought many tanks into South Korea and is planning to transfer new types of military aircraft to Seoul. Washington is augmenting the U.S. forces in South Korea instead of reducing them. It is also taking new steps to strengthen the military capabilities of the Seoul regime.

U.S. and South Korean public figures frequently say that the U.S. forces must remain in South Korea until peace comes. However, the proposals of the People's Korea for the phased withdrawal of the U.S. forces from South Korea, for drastically alleviating the military and political confrontation, for turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, and for stopping large military exercises are indeed a way to achieve peace and ease tension on the Korean peninsula soon. These proposals are for security of both North and South Korea.

Some time ago, the DPRK Government once again appealed to the United States and South Korea for stopping the military activities which can hamper confidence-building possible through tripartite talks. Pyongyang decided not to stage any military exercise in which nuclear weapons and their delivery means are mobilized on the Korean peninsula and in its surrounding waters beginning with the new year and to limit the scale of military force to be mobilized in military exercises to the size of a division. Pyongyang thinks that the armed forces of the DPRK and South Korea must never participate in any joint military exercise with a third country.

The Pyongyang's proposals are in harmony with the policy and line of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries designed to develop the trend of demilitarization in Asia and in the Pacific region and to establish amicable and cooperative relations in the region. Nonetheless, Washington's unconstructive stand is still detrimental. The U.S. preparations for war being made in the Far East, in South Korea in particular, is specific proof. This situation cannot last forever. The trend of militarization must be brought to an end and a trend of seeking the way to peace and security must begin instead.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Lao Premier Kaysone Stops Over in Moscow

PM2012150889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Departure From Moscow"]

[Text] Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers, left Moscow for home on 18 December after stopping over in the Soviet Union en route from France.

Vietnamese Party Delegation Visits USSR

PM2012151489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties, a delegation of Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] workers headed by Dinh Ngoc Shon [as transliterated], deputy chief of the CPV Central Committee Nationalities Department, was in the Soviet Union 10 through 18 December to study the CPSU's experience of work in resolving problems of interethnic relations.

The Vietnamese comrades had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee Department of National Relations and the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy and Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and visited the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic.

Moscow Observer Hails New Phnom Penh Initiative

BK2112153589 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Station observer Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] The complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia on 26 September created a new situation for a comprehensive political solution to the Cambodian problem. It is regrettable that the Cambodian opposition groups have rejected every initiative put forward by Phnom Penh toward such a solution and have placed their hope on the use of force instead. Consequently, the situation in Cambodia has deteriorated and become complex as civil war rages on.

What can be done in order to prevent this event from becoming more negative and bring the Cambodian problem into the current of political solution? Our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, has this to comment:

To this end, first of all, it is necessary to avert the amplification of fighting in Cambodia. It is imperative to stop the fighting. How can we do it?

In the view of Phnom Penh, under the present circumstances, the most effective means is to revive as soon as possible the dialogue between the conflicting Cambodian factions with the participation of all countries concerned. This dialogue, at one time, contributed most significantly to preparing an atmosphere favorable to the Cambodian solution. Certainly, it was the Jakarta meetings which conjured up a prologue for the convening last August of the Paris international conference on Cambodia. For this reason, the resumption of the political

dialogue under the current circumstances has become absolutely imperative. This is the stance to which Phnom Penh has adhered.

As Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the State of Cambodia, emphasized a few days ago, his government would continue to do everything it could in order to bring a negotiated end to the on-going conflict.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of our listeners to an important aspect of Phnom Penh's stance, that is, Phnom Penh's preparedness to promote the establishment of an international control mechanism to monitor the cease-fire and the cessation of all foreign military aid to various Cambodian factions. According to the view of the Government of the State of Cambodia, this question will surely be raised for discussion during another informal meeting in Jakarta.

In this sense, the stance of the Government of the State of Cambodia concerning the role to be played by the United Nations will deserve high appreciation. Phnom Penh holds that should there be an agreement on the formation of a provisional organization of authority in Cambodia during the transitional period, the United Nations would surely be permitted to play a supervisory role and also to monitor the preparations for the holding of general elections in Cambodia. However, for this cause, it is necessary that the Cambodian seat at the United Nations which has been illegally occupied by the Pol Pot gang should be declared vacant first.

The Soviet Union hails this new initiative of Phnom Penh. In its statement, the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union considered this initiative as an important act of good will of the Government of the State of Cambodia, an act which opens favorable possibilities for the step-by-step advance toward comprehensively resolving the problem.

The Soviet stance was reiterated a few days ago by Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev during his talks with the Lao leader, Comrade Kaysone Phomvihan. Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev stressed for instance that for the time being it is important to prevent civil war from spreading all over hapless Cambodia. All parties involved should be allowed to resume negotiations in a constructive spirit.

Comparison on Gorbachev-Laos' Kaysone Meeting

PM1912103389

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 19 December 1989 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a TASS report on M.S. Gorbachev's 18 December meeting with Kaysone Phomvihan. The PRAVDA item, entitled "M.S. Gorbachev's Conversation with K. Phomvihan," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in 19 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 18, revealing the following variations:

Column one, paragraph one, first sentence reads in PRAVDA: "18 December" instead of "today";

Column one, paragraph two, fifth sentence reads in PRAVDA: ...Japan, and France which, in his evaluation, helped to strengthen the republic's international positions and to more actively involve it in world economic relations.

M.S. Gorbachev welcomed ... (retranslating, picking up third paragraph first sentence);

Column two, penultimate paragraph, second sentence reads in PRAVDA: ...Cambodia and to constructively continue talks between the... (retranslating)

Foreign Ministry Statement on Cambodia Comparison

PM1812164989

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 17 December carries in its Morning Edition on page 15 a USSR Foreign Ministry statement on Cambodia. The IZVESTIYA item, entitled "USSR Foreign Ministry Statement," has been compared with the Moscow Radio in Cambodian version published in the 18 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 12-13, revealing the following variations:

Page 12, column two, IZVESTIYA starts: Nearly 3 months have passed since the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese military subunits from Cambodia. It is generally recognized that this action created a qualitatively new situation for comprehensively solving... (omitting introductory paragraph and retranslating);

Page 13, column one, paragraph two, sentence one, IZVESTIYA reads: ...statement as another expression of a constructive approach to aspects of the settlement that have not yet been agreed upon and... (retranslating);

Page 13, column one, paragraph two, penultimate sentence, IZVESTIYA reads: ...is a practical contribution to speeding up the elimination of the conflict in Southeast Asia. It is now important that all interested parties also demonstrate realism and reciprocal readiness for compromise.

For its part... (picking up last paragraph; retranslating).

Near East & South Asia

Western Anti-Iranian 'Propaganda' Noted

NC2112130089 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Recently the Western mass media disseminated (?fabricated) reports pertaining to Iran's foreign policy. At present an atmosphere intended to denigrate Iran has been created around Iran's foreign policy.

Most of today's Western newspapers carried bold headlines saying "Iran Sells Oil to Israel." Almost all the Western news agencies and radios have carried this report. Naturally the inventor of this hot piece of news was the United States. Mrs Margaret Tutwiler, the U.S. State Department spokeswoman, said that Tel Aviv purchases oil from Iran. The NBC television network featured this report, according to which Israel had signed an accord with Iran for the purchase of 2 million barrels of crude oil to the value of $36 million.

The Western publications assume that the purpose of this is the release of Israeli soldiers and the Western and Lebanese hostages. In this way, the Islamic Republic is being vociferously (?maligned) for terrorist activities and for flouting principles of Iranian foreign policy. Meanwhile, Tehran has announced that all such reports on its alleged sale of oil to Israel are baseless and are an attempt to tarnish the Islamic revolution's credibility.

It appears possible that the West has embarked on a new era of propagandistic war against Iran's leadership and is trying once more to discredit Iran in international circles and, most of all, in the eyes of the Islamic world. It may be mentioned that the Western countries had anticipated major changes in Iran's foreign policy with the coming into power of the new government cadre. Analysts were speculating that Iran would retreat before the West and renege on its principled stance on the international scene. However, this has not occurred. Therefore Western propaganda renewed its (?attacks) on Iran. Thus this report on oil transactions between Iran and Israel was a (?low) propaganda stunt.

It is interesting that recently Western publications have been stirring up all sorts of sentiment against Iran. For example, there was talk of an impasse in the Iran-Iraq talks. In addition, Western mass media sought to reap political capital from the exacerbation of the situation, by carrying detailed reports on the Iraqi long-range ballistic missile and commenting on it from various angles. A tense atmosphere which could trigger a confrontation has been whipped up with great intensity, and gloomy predictions and possibilities are being published by military experts in Western newspapers.

However, [words indistinct] is not easy in the Iran-Iraq talks and may even be [word indistinct]. It is for this reason that, in assessing a situation, one must be cautious in drawing conclusions. Today the Western propaganda does not seem to (?adhere to) this principle. It is [word indistinct] to say how long this anti-Iranian process will continue. In the past 10 years, such propaganda has been immense. However it has not lasted very long and only the vestiges of [words indistinct] and an unrealistic attitude have remained.

Moscow RPP Comments on Iran-Iraq Talks

NC2112130889 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] In New York the UN secretary general held a round of talks with the foreign ministers of Iran and Iraq on resolving the bilateral dispute between the two countries. The talks did not make any special headway in extricating Iran-Iraq relations from the impasse they are in. The two sides continue to maintain an attitude of mutual intolerance. [passage omitted]

It seems Tehran and Baghdad are displaying indifference in arranging for an opportunity for constructive talks and realistic steps with regard to a final peace accord. It appears that the reason for this lackadaisical attitude is far more complicated than it appears. The knot of animosity and lack of mutual trust date back well before the commencement of the 8-year war. The relations between Iran and Iraq only worsened during the war. This knot can be unraveled only through effort and a desire to do so.

The period of talks should be respected and dangers of the repercussions of the no-war, no-peace situation should be carefully considered. It is clear that a military solution of the conflict is not possible at this juncture when the two sides have boosted their destructive defenses, and have stockpiled arsenals with weapons such as (?chemical) missiles. [passage omitted].

It appears that any basis for the success of the Iran-Iraq peace talks must lie in respect on the part of Iran and Iraq for two principles which are linked together. They are, first of all, a recognition that the occupation of another's territory by force is unlawful and, second, the realization that boundaries are inviolable. If there is adherence to these fundamental principles, the most complicated and perplexing issues which confront Tehran and Baghdad today can be resolved.

Israel's Policy on Golan Heights Hit

PM2012115989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[I. Novikov report: "Toward a New Security System—TASS Diplomatic Correspondent Reports From USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] V.P. Perfilyev [first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Administration] reminded journalists that on 14 December 1981 the decision was taken by Israel to extend the application of that country's laws to the the Golan Heights belonging to Syria. This illegal act, grossly flouting the UN Charter, was seen by the world community as an attempt to annex territory which had been Syrian from time immemorial, and it was resolutely condemned. But Israel refused to comply with UN Security Council Resolution 497 dated 17 December 1987 which called on Tel Aviv to reexamine immediately its illegal decision, and it continues to occupy the Golan Heights. In the intervening years the Israeli authorities have systematically worked toward virtually detaching this territory from Syria and joining it economically and politically to Israel. The unceasing

attempts to deprive the resident population of Syrian citizenship cannot fail to cause concern. By resolutely condemning Israel's encroachment on other lands, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, we are showing solidarity with Syria, to whom the Golan Heights must be returned. [passage omitted]

Afghan State Security Preempts Coup Attempt

PM2112140989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA special correspondent V. Snegirev "Afghan Reportage": "There Was No Coup"]

[Text] Kabul, Dec—The leaders of the country's state security and law enforcement organs rarely appear on Kabul television. But on 15 December viewers of a popular evening television program saw Yar Muhammad, first deputy [title as published] of the Afghan Ministry of State Security, and Sayyed Sharaf, the republic's general prosecutor, on their screens.

The reason for their appearance was extremely serious: The point is that residents of the capital had been agog with rumors for several days now. There had been talk of mass arrests, a ramified conspiracy, and mutiny among generals. These rumors had prompted hasty reports in some Western mass media.

So what actually happened in the Afghan capital? It must be admitted that a week ago there was indeed a sense of some tension in the atmosphere in Kabul. Patrols were stationed at intersections (the people of Kabul had grown unaccustomed to this unattractive sight in the city landscape) and the guard on government installations was reinforced.

In early December the Ministry of State Security issued a statement to the press saying that they had uncovered the underground network of a combat organization belonging to the diehard opposition. Arrests began, and in time three generals, a large number of army officers, along with Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ministry of State Security staffers and civilians, found themselves in jail under investigation. Yar Muhammad said on television that in all 127 people have been arrested. An investigation is under way. Moreover, according to the state security leader, most of the detainees have fully admitted their guilt, and state security organs have documents and facts proving the others guilty of illegal actions. The general prosecutor stressed in turn that the investigation is being conducted in painstaking compliance with the law and he is personally monitoring the progress of the inquiry.

This is perhaps the first time of late that the existing regime in Kabul has been threatened, if not with the danger of immediate overthrow, then at least with very serious upheavals with unpredictable consequences. A great deal of blood could have been shed.

The full picture of the conspiracy will only emerge at the end of the investigation. At present the following is known for sure. The "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" underground combat organization, led by Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, has been in existence for several years. It has been responsible for 10 explosions in densely-peopled areas, including acts of terrorism at the polytechnical institute, in a residential district, and near the Indian Embassy that cost many lives. The organization's activity was sharply stepped up last year when it succeeded in enlisting a number of prominent military men and thus in recruiting a considerable number of middle-level officers. The confusion in certain army staffs and subunits in connection with the impending Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan helped this.

Hekmatyar's agents must be given their due: They exploited this favorable situation with particular vigor, reinforcing the underground movement with scared people uncertain of the future. These included prominent members of the apparatus of the Defense Ministry, air defense forces, and artillery. Incidentally, he himself and people from his entourage publicly bragged of a large underground network in Kabul—I was told this by British journalist Liz Duset [surname as transliterated], who has just arrived from Peshawar—possibly in order to enhance the reputation of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan.

But if there is a rifle hanging up on stage, the laws of drama decree that it must be fired without fail. Several months ago a command came from Islamic Party of Afghanistan headquarters: Carry out the plan to overthrow Najibullah's government.

It was proposed that four mujahidin regiments would be moved along the highway built by the opposition from the so-called Parachinar Ridge in Pakistan to the suburbs of Kabul. But since events around Jalalabad showed that a direct attack was hopeless, the regiments were assigned to a diversionary maneuver. The intention was for the conspirators to strike from within once all the units defending the capital were involved in this war. The plan prescribed down to the finest details which battery led by a traitor would open fire—and when and where—(these batteries on the hills around Kabul can cover the entire city with their fire), who would storm the president's palace, and who was to kill the defense minister—if he did not join the putschists.

I will not conjecture what their chances of success were. One thing is clear: Blood could have been shed at any rate and a new wave of destabilization, violence, and devastation would have swept the country. In this connection I would like to remind readers that Hekmatyar, who aspires to the role of ruler of Afghanistan, and his party are the most diehard opponents of the existing authorities.

Another fact gives this case quite a special overtone: Islamic Party of Afghanistan spies have frequently

checked our border guards' vigilance of late by carrying out forays onto USSR territory.

...Most of the detainees who frankly admitted their guilt now bitterly repent their actions. Many claim that their activity within the Islamic Party of Afghanistan underground organization was only a matter of paying membership dues. Evidently, justice will treat this with maximum humanity. However, we must not underestimate the damage that has been done: For instance, hundreds of secret documents concerning the air defense missiles guarding the skies over Kabul, radiotechnical equipment, and communications and radio intercept systems have been transferred to Islamic Party of Afghanistan safes.

Reports from Peshawar indicate that the failure provoked a shock reaction within the opposition camp: In the heat of the moment the "fighters for the faith" even executed two former members of the underground organization who had escaped from Kabul. The order was given to slaughter the families of arrested underground leaders suspected of treachery.

Meanwhile life in the capital itself has once again returned to normal.

Syrian Defense Minister Arrives in Moscow 18 Dec

PM2012131189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Working Visit"]

[Text] General M. Talas, member of the Ba'th Party leadership and Syrian defense minister, arrived in the Soviet Union on a working visit 18 December.

The guests and the officials accompanying him were met at the airport by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, Army General I.M. Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, and other officials.

The welcoming party included Muhammad 'Isam al-Na'ib, Syrian ambassador to the USSR, and Major General A.K. al-Muhammad, military attache at the Syrian Embassy in the USSR.

Army Gen Moiseyev received Gen M. Talas the same day. Questions of mutual interest were discussed during their talks.

Army Gen Moiseyev gave a dinner in the Syrian guest's honor.

East Europe

Soviet Media Report on Romanian Events

Ceausescu TV Address Raises Questions

PM2212135789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA own correspondent V. Vedrashko dispatch under general heading: "Events in Romania"]

[Text] Bucharest, 21 Dec—Romanian President N. Ceausescu delivered a specch on television yesterday evening. His statement was the Romanian authorities' first official announcement regarding the tragic events in Timisoara.

Groups of hooligan elements, the statement said, held a series of demonstrations 16 and 17 December, during which buildings and stores were destroyed and looted. Actions directed against state and party figures and against a number of troop units were stepped up 17 December, the report indicated. It pointed out that the inhabitants of Timisoara witnessed actions of a terrorist nature.

It follows from the statement that military force was used. It said that the troops "when attacked, retaliated with warning fire" and were then forced to defend themselves against "antinational terrorist groupings."

Our army units showed great forbearance, N. Ceausescu said, when called on to defend the independence and sovereignty of their homeland. According to the president, they were only forced to retaliate after terrorist gangs threatened order in the judet.

The statement spoke of the need to defend socialist gains in the future. It did not elaborate on the number of "hooligan groups" and "terrorist gangs" or on the total number of casualties on both sides. The report asserted: "It can be said with total certainty that these terrorist actions were organized and unleashed in close connection with reactionary imperialist chauvinist circles and spy services in various countries."

Later that evening Bucharest announced that a state of emergency in Timis Judet had been announced by presidential decree

According to unofficial reports from various places, the situation in the country is still complex. Everyone is worried by the following question: How could groups of hooligan elements have provoked such wide-ranging retaliatory measures by the authorities? Why were troops defending the country's independence on the streets of a Romanian judet capital? And, last, what was the source of the "terrorist" manifestations in the republic?

Timisoara Workers Occupy Factories

LD2112175289 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 21 TASS—Industrial enterprises have reportedly ground to a standstill in the Romanian city of Timisoara. Having occupied factories, workers threaten to blow them up if authorities do not meet their conditions.

The workers demand that the country's leadership resign and that the party, military and other officials whose actions led to human casualties in the city be brought to account.

The workers also demand the withdrawal of the army units that have massed in the city over the past few days.

According to the latest accounts, the troops have started leaving Timisoara.

Fighting in Bucharest 21 Dec

LD2112181689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 21 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Dmitriy Dyadkov reports:

The TASS correspondent has just returned from Mageru Street. A group of demonstrators, having come from the University Square, told passersby that there, as the result of being driven over [nayezd bronemashiny] by an armored vehicle, at least two people have died. When the group of eyewitnesses rushed to pull the victims out from under the wheels of the armored car, a volley of automatic fire was released at them. People scattered in all directions. At the place of the incident several other people remained motionless, apart from the other victims.

Official Denies Casualties

LD2112215989 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Morozov:

A meeting is under way in the University Square in Bucharest. Speakers, mostly young people, replace one another.

Slogans of anti-government contents are proclaimed. They are chanted by people in the square.

Helicopters appear above the square from time to time.

All the streets leading to the square are blocked by lines of militiamen and helmeted soldiers armed with truncheons and having plastic shields.

Tanks with running motors churn out clouds of smoke.

Groups of young people crowding before soldiers chant "The Army Is With Us," "No Violence".

Large letters "V" are smeared on the walls.

Somebody is writing slogans on posters.

From time to time, tanks and army vehicles run out into the crowd, but it is not to be dispersed.

When the dark sets in, street lamps are switched on in the square.

The TASS correspondent tried to approach people protecting order. On the corner of the street from which the view of the square opened, the correspondent was taken to a thick-set plainclothed man and asked him to describe the situation.

"You witness the generation which was brought up on video films, and here are the results... You can see here what has already happened in Moscow," he said.

"I heard sounds of shots. Who was firing and is there loss of life?" the correspondent asked.

"There is no loss of life. There has not been a single casualty."

"But I have seen the wounded being carried to ambulances."

"These were people who had no time to dine, got overexcited and fainted," he said.

"Who are you?"

"I am just a representative of the working people who helps to preserve order," the man said.

Two militiamen who accompanied this correspondent passed for lines of soliders and a considerable number of tanks, told me that they have been issued with blank cartridges, and that all the shots were really made by blank cartridges. [sentence as received]

Protesters Rally at Factories

LD2112200289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1855 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 21 Dec (TASS) By 2100 hours Moscow time tension in the Romanian capital is rising. The main group of demonstrators on University Square is being joined by still more numerous groups of people, some consisting of 200-300 people, and the total number of people gathered at this hour on the square is up to several tens of thousands of people. At present a column of demonstrators of 7-8,000 people is moving in the direction of the square.

It has become known that during the daytime student representatives sent their delegates to the major enterprises and factories in the capital. They called on the workers to come out at night on the streets and squares of the city and declare a general strike tomorrow.

The servicemen of the Army of the Socialist Republic of Romania, militia, and law and order enforcement bodies are conducting themselves calmly.

In the streets adjoining the scene of the events there are additional forces of law and order.

Romanian radio and television are still transmitting the content of N. Ceausescu's morning speech at the meeting, the decisions of today's session of the Political Executive Committee of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committe and patriotic songs too.

Demonstrations Grow 21 Dec

LD2112210189 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 21 TASS—The situation in the Romanian capital remains tense. More people joined the ranks of demonstrators.

There is light in all the windows of the houses in the places where there are demonstrations.

People got into balconies. Some of them shout slogans supporting the rallies.

Soldiers and militamen do not answer remarks of demonstrators.

There is yet no official response to the events in Bucharest. Romanian radio and television and AGERPRES news agency do not report demonstrations in Bucharest.

Protesters Confront Security Forces

LD2112224989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2208 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 22 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondents Dmitriy Dyakov and Nikolay Morozov report:

The confrontation between demonstrators and the forces of law and order is continuing on University Square in the center of the Romanian capital. The ranks of the protestors are being suppiemented without interruption by people coming in from the outskirts of the city. For their part, the authorities are bringing fire engines and military equipment to the square. At around 2300 hours, local time, [21 December] a representative of the Armed Forces addressed the demonstrators through a megaphone, trying to persuade them to disperse, but he had no success. A few minutes later, teargas canisters were exploded above the heads of the crowd, and the whole square was filled with thick, stifling smoke. Some of the demonstrators withdrew into adjacent small streets, but immediately after the gas had dispersed slightly the square filled up again with people. In reply, the demonstrators began shouting "We Shall Not Leave!" Two cars standing outside the "Intercontinental" Hotel were set on fire. Tanks and water cannon vehicles came out onto the square several times, evidently trying to intimidate the demonstrators. Addressing the forces of law and order, people shouted "We Are the People!" "We Are Not Terrorists!" and, "You Are Eating the People's Bread!" At this moment, fire engines are trying to extinguish burning trucks, and mass volleys from teargas guns are continuing.

No official reports on the events in Bucharest have come in as yet.

21-22 Dec Night Scene Described

LD2212041389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0053 GMT 22 Dec 89

["The Situation Remains Tense in Bucharest"—TASS headline]

[Text] Bucharest, 22 December—TASS correspondent Dmitriy Dyakov and Nikolay Morozov report:

At about 0100 in the night local time subunits of soldiers and militia started to drive the people who had encircled the square back into side streets. Through the chain of representatives of the forces of law and order one could see a tank or armored troop carrier burning in the center of University Square—inside it cartridges were exploding with loud crackling. It was impossible to know whether the soldiers had completely cleared the square or whether they had isolated on it a group of the most active and stubborn demonstrators. According to assertions by people leaving the square, until recently some 100 people remained there.

The square and its environs continue to be covered with a dense cloud of suffocating smoke, bursts of submachineguns can be heard, and numerous ambulances and militia vans are dashing about across the square at great speed.

According to witnesses there are dead [rubityye] and injured among the demonstrators. One of the young people, with tears in his eyes, showed those standing round him the identity card of his comrade, who according to him had been shot on the square—the identity card was drenched in blood. We saw how the unconscious bodies of two juveniles were being carried away into side streets.

The militiamen of the special forces units, whose aggressiveness had increased markedly, were threatening with submachine guns passersby who had been flattened against the walls of the houses. We saw how they were smashing the windows of a food shop for no reason, causing the indignation of inhabitants who were observing their actions from the balconies of a neighboring house.

The number of people in the environs of University Square has dwindled considerably, the silence which has fallen is being broken only from time to time by the rumble of heavy trucks and isolated shots; the central part of the city is gradually becoming deserted.

As before, there are no official reports concerning the events in Bucharest. Romanian broadcasting stopped work earlier than usual.

22 Dec Morning 'Calm Situation'

LD2212103189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0838 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Excerpts] [No dateline as received] In the early hours of the morning a calm situation remains in the Romanian capital. Municipal transport is operating and food shops are open. People are going to work. But, the gusto usually seen on the streets at this time of day is absent and there are considerably fewer private cars.

A number of streets leading to University Square, which has been cleared of demonstrators, have been cordoned off by dense ranks of troops and militia with anti-riot shields. Five large buses, filled with troops, stand outside the "Intercontinental" Hotel. Workers have cleared broken glass and trash from the road and the sidewalk in the square itself where several windows of shops, cafes, and state buildings were smashed. [passage omitted]

A powerful surge of demonstrators, chanting "The Army Is With Us" and "We the People," mingled with the bewildered soldiers standing in Republic Boulevard. Hundreds of people climbed onto tanks and the armored personnel carriers and unfurled banners reading "We Are for Freedom," "We Want Democracy," and "Down With Dictatorship." There was an unimaginable din. The crowd was celebrating and applauding.

Eyewitnesses say that tanks and APC's [armored personnel carriers] are standing on Palace Square with their engines running.

Shots Heard 22 Dec Morning

LD2212092789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0815 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 22 Dec—TASS correspondent Nikolay Morozov reports: After 0800 local time, when it was completely light, helicopters once again circled over Bucharest and shots were heard again. On the central Mageru Street, which is open only for pedestrian traffic, cleaning machines are working constantly, and along the sidewalk stand rows of policemen and soldiers. Militia representatives immediately detain pedestrians who stop.

It has become clear that the main group of demonstrators has been forced out of University Square onto the Boulevard of the Republic, which from the side of the square has been blocked off by a column of tanks and by law enforcement forces armed with submachineguns with bayonets attached. From time to time reports of tracer bullets can be heard and the suffocating smell of teargas lingers on the boulevard. Frightened weeping women are to be met.

The demonstrators, many of whom are holding lit candles in their hands, are continuing to declaim antigovernment slogans. Young people are writing the same slogans in chalk on shop windows, walls, and on trolleybuses, which are standing with their tires deflated. The main group of demonstrators, not more than 200-300 people, is constantly being increased by people coming from the opposite end of the boulevard who are also shouting out slogans. In answer to the question of a TASS correspondent as to from where the people are coming, one young man answered: "From the 'Mekhanika Finey' factory and 'Aversa'"; another said "from everywhere."

As has been reported, noise and shots can be heard in other rayons of the city, too.

Demonstrators Win Army Support

LD2212103989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1005 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 22 Dec—Vadim Malyutin, TASS correspondent, reports. The situation in Bucharest has been getting more and more exacerbated with every passing minute since this morning. The columns of demonstrators which are constantly moving toward the center of the city form crowds numbering several hundred thousand people along the central Mageru Street, University Square, the Avenue of the Republic, and the Roman Square. Everywhere slogans are heard: "The Army Is With Us," "We Are the People," "Down With Dictatorship," and in some places there is fraternizing with the soldiers. Demonstrators are talking about the fact that a strike has apparently started at the leading enterprises in the city. Reports continue to come in about mass popular demonstrations in other parts of Bucharest. The forces of law and order and the regular army have surrounded Palace Square, firing automatic weapons into the air from time to time. Romanian radio is playing patriotic songs. The television is not working.

Defense Minister Commits Suicide

LD2212103389 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 22 TASS—Romanian Defence Minister General Vasile Milea has committed suicide, Romanian radio reports.

National Salvation Front Assumes Power

LD2212121489 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Power in Romania has been assumed by the National Salvation Front headed by the former Foreign Minister Corneliu Manescu. The front is...news agencies report that the people have seized the residence of President Nicolae Ceausescu, whose whereabouts are unknown. [sentence as heard] The streets of Bucharest are flooded with hundreds of thousands of people.

Demonstrators Broadcast to Nation

LD2212122389 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 22 TASS—The demonstrators, who occupied the studio of Romanian radio and television, are now addressing the nation.

"Brothers, Romanians," an announcer said in an emotional voice, "we came here to tell you that the dictator has fallen." At last the country has ridden itself of those who plundered it for many years. Speakers urged demonstrators to observe order and avoid acts of violence.

An employee of the newspaper SCINTEIA said that tomorrow for the first time in 40 years people will read the truthful newspaper.

A central radio announcer said that for the first time today he said what he thought.

Radio and television continue their broadcasts.

Protesters Occupy RCP CC Building

LD2212124889 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 22 TASS—By TASS correspondents Dmitriy Dyakov and Nikolay Morozov:

The Palace Square is thronged by hundreds of thousands of people chanting "Down With the Dictatorship", "We Demand a Trial", "Power to the People".

The crowds are being addressed from the balcony of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee [RCP CC] building, from which Nicolae Ceausescu spoke but yesterday, by people from among the demonstrators.

Demonstrators are also seen standing in the building's open windows.

There are tanks and armoured carriers at the entrance of the building with hundreds of people on them waving unfurled streamers and flags. Powerful loudspeakers are installed in the square. It has just been announced that a political manifestation would be held here shortly. The authors of the announcement are unknown.

Another column of many thousands of demonstrators accompanied by captured tanks and armoured carriers, and waving flags and streamers, headed for the building of Romanian radio and television. They want to demand the resignation of TV leaders and truthful coverage of developments in the country.

Demonstrations are reportedly taking place in other Romanian towns, too.

Bucharest 'Controlled by People'

LD2212124389 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 22 Dec 89

["Nicolae Ceausescu on the Run"—TASS headline]

[Text] Bucharest December 22 TASS—Demonstrators that occupied Romanian radio and television today said Nicolae Ceausescu's "whereabouts are unknown."

Addressing the people on Romanian television, the popular actor Sergiu Nicolaescu urged "the Romanian leaders who prize the ideals of freedom," to come to the TV studio and "together with the people" to draft calmly an appeal to the nation and to elect worthy national leaders.

Addressing the Army and the Militia, he said that they should defend the interests of the people and not fire at them. He urged the workers and all the people of the country to turn out into the streets and peacefully occupy the municipal councils in order to assume control over all the towns, enterprises and institutions.

Eminent poet Mircea Dinescu, who was in disfavour in recent years for his bold and freedom-loving verses and advocacy of political reforms, addressed the demonstrators.

The crowds are elated. Automobiles are hooting everywhere. Army posts have disappeared from the streets and squares. The town is mostly controlled by the people.

General Calls for Ceausescu Arrest

LD2212132389 Moscow TASS in English 1317 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest December 22 TASS—Lieutenant-General Mihai Kizac, commander of the Bucharest Garrison, went on Bucharest television today.

"All men of the Bucharest Garrison," he said, "must support the new political orientation in our country. All units stationed in the city must firmly rebuff those who may try to turn back the events."

Mihai Kizac also called on all commanders and officers of the Romanian Army to support the people's desire for freedom in all the country's districts and towns.

He urged the military units at Titu, from the airport of which Nicolae Ceausescu allegedly wants to fly abroad, to arrest and deliver Ceausescu to Bucharest to be put on trial by the people.

TV and radio statements of people's representatives are continuing.

Hungary's Medgyessy, Nemeth Receive Gusev

LD2112235389 Budapest MTI in English 2040 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest, December 21 (MTI)—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Gusev arrived in Budapest on Thursday, meeting an invitation from Deputy Prime Minister Peter Medgyessy. Mr Gusev is to attend the meeting of the co-chairmen of the Hungarian-Soviet

Intergovernmental Committee for Economic and Technical and Scientific Cooperation.

Mr Gusev was met at Ferihegy Airport by Mr Medgyessy and Lajos Berenyi, vice-president of the National Planning Office.

The co-chairmen of the committee opened talks during the day. They are to review the tasks arising from the principal agreements reached at the last prime ministerial meeting, and concrete issues of Hungarian-Soviet economic cooperation for 1990.

Prime Minister Miklos Nemeth met Mr Gusev on Thursday evening.

CPSU 'Cordial' Greetings to MSZMP Congress

LD1712163789 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—Cordial greetings to Hungarian communists rallying around the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party [HSWP or MSZMP] have been sent to the HSWP Congress by the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

The telegram addressed to the congress that opened in Budapest today wishes Hungarian communists success in democratic renewal of Hungary and in the consolidation of left forces acting from socialist positions.

Poland's Walesa: Pluralistic Reforms Necessary

LD2212124989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1116 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Dec (TASS)—"We must extricate ourselves from our current situation if we do not wish to fall behind civilization," Lech Walesa declared in an interview published by the latest edition of the magazine EKHO PLANETY. The leader of Polish "Solidarity," who arrived in Moscow recently to attend the funeral of Academician Andrey Sakharov, stressed that he does not see for the Soviet Union or Poland any choice other than pluralistic reforms in the economy, politics, and social spheres.

At the same time, Lech Walesa expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union as a superpower cannot afford haste or lack of deliberation in the process of transformations.

Walesa's Call for Emergency Powers Viewed

PM2212151589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[V. Runov commentary: "Call for Democracy. Solidarity Leader Proposes Polish Government Be Given Emergency Powers"]

[Text] Nobel Prize winner Lech Walesa, who enjoys great authority in Poland, is now formally just the chairman of the "Solidarity" trade union whose strength and influence is still difficult to determine. Everyone expects a great deal to be clarified during the trade union's second congress at the beginning of next year. Meanwhile, as a TASS correspondent reports to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, "Solidarity" as a social movement seems to have split into three main parts: government, Citizens' Parliamentary Club, and trade union, which at the moment is clearly in the shadow of the two former forces which possess concrete power. Despite this, Walesa himself continues to belong to the small group of current Polish leaders, but it is hard to say where he ranks.

Such an introduction is absolutely necessary to be able to understand the sense of one of L. Walesa's latest statements, which he made last week. It concerns his proposal that the Polish Council of Ministers be given special powers. This statement came as a surprise to everyone, including Prime Minister T. Mazowiecki himself. This was stated openly by government press spokesperson M. Niezabitowska right after Walesa's speech. The "Solidarity" leader was proposing that the government be given very substantial powers. In particular, that it be granted the right to restructure the economy, make amendments in the sphere of ownership, demonopolize the state and cooperative sectors, reform the tax system and the activity of banks, and change the state structure, including the organs of territorial self-government. Legal acts issued by the government on the basis of its special powers would come into effect the moment they are announced. At the same time, Walesa stipulated that the Sejm must give the government these powers for a strictly determined period of time, during which parliament could work in peace on other important problems.

All the same, M. Niezabitowska noted soon after that L. Walesa's proposal was important evidence of support for the Council of Ministers, and if the Sejm, as she stated, approves this initiative, then the government will enjoy special powers. However, other political forces in the country reacted negatively to the "Solidarity" leader's statement. The National Trade Union Council Executive Committee Secretariat, for example, stressed that L. Walesa's initiative is tantamount to the implementation of a kind of "martial law" in the national economy, as well as leading to a restriction on citizens' rights and practically excluding the trade unions from the sphere of public life. The document expresses the conviction that all working people who are members of trade unions will fittingly evaluate this unprecedented attempt on the democratic freedoms which have been won with such difficulty. Leszek Miller, Politburo member and Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee secretary, said in an interview with TRYBUNA LUDU on this subject that the position of Mazowiecki's government is a very complex one. The necessary economic reforms require tough measures in the social sphere and certain sacrifices on the part of the whole population—"belt tightening." However, the PZPR has always warned that the economic burden connected with carrying out reforms in the national economy must be

spread fairly among everyone and that it is the state authorities' direct duty to guarantee social protection for the less well off strata of the population. There is no such attitude in the program of L. Balcerowicz, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, TRYBUNA LUDU notes. It is not the actual idea of the government having emergency powers that is surprising. The governments of Messner and Rakowski had such rights, despite the hostility of the opposition at that time. The PZPR supports the Mazowiecki government's reform initiatives and does not shrink from participating in difficult and painful decisions if they are necessary, L. Miller stressed. At the same time, two conditions must be fulfilled: obtaining the consensus of the whole population and preserving the parliamentary procedure for discussing such innovations.

Even the deputies' Citizens Club, which brings together senators and "Solidarity" deputies, has taken a dim view of Walesa's initiative. The parliamentarians unanimously noted that the intensive legislative activity of the Sejm and Senate will enable them to fulfill their duty to Poland as deputies without resorting to giving the cabinet emergency powers.

It only now remains to sum up and draw a conclusion about what has essentially happened. The commentators are racking their brains: What did L. Walesa have in mind when submitting such a proposal? Some people suppose that he has lost his bearings in the current Polish situation since his triumphant trips abroad and his impressions from them. The "Solidarity" leader likes to repeat that he is an amateur in politics. And judging by the reaction of the Sejm and the Senate, this time the parliamentarians are agreeing with him on this matter.

Communique on USSR Visit by CSSR's Calfa

LD2112021589 Prague CTK in English 2358 GMT 20 Dec 89

["Parts of Communique on Czechoslovak Premier's Visit"—CTK headline]

[Text] Moscow Dec 20 (CTK correspondents)—Today's Czechoslovak-Soviet talks confirmed complete mutual understanding, attachment of both sides to new political thinking and the priority of humanitarian values, said a joint Czechoslovak-Soviet communique issued here today at the close of one-day working visit of Czechoslovak Premier Marian Calfa to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet side stated that the Soviet Union considers the current changes in Czechoslovakia a result of internal processes which reflect the ripe needs to revive society's life.

Nikolay Ryzhkov pointed out that the Soviet Union regards Czechoslovakia a close friend, ally and neighbour with whom it is linked by traditionally broad and many-sided ties. The Soviet side is prepared for close cooperation with the new Czechoslovak leadership and with all Czechoslovak political and social forces willing to cooperate.

Czechoslovak and Soviet representatives discussed issues connected with restructuring the mechanism of multilateral and bilateral cooperation and a gradual transition to a new system of mutual payments with the use of convertible currencies on the basis of world prices. They agreed to create a bilateral commission charged with the preparation of concrete proposals on this issue.

Premiers of the two governments Marian Calfa and Eduard Shevardnadze [as received] stressed the great importance of the Warsaw Treaty for maintaining the stable balance both in Europe and in general East-West relations. They called for strengthening political functions in its activities and for reinforcement of its members' cooperation. They expressed their conviction that the establishment of contacts between political and military officials of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO would contribute to overcome a confrontation and to build a safer world.

Reportage on CPCZ Extraordinary Congress

First Day's Proceedings

PM2112112989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA special correspondents S. Vtorushin and A. Krushinskiy dispatch: "At the Extraordinary Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Congress"]

[Text] Prague, 20 Dec—The extraordinary Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Congress opened today in Prague's Palace of Culture. A total of 1,618 delegates are taking part in it. Unlike past congresses, this one is being held without any preliminary nationwide discussion of the main documents that it is to adopt.

On the streets of the Czechoslovak capital many buildings are plastered with appeals from the most diverse social movements and trends, but we did not see a single slogan dedicated to the highest party forum or addressed to its delegates. Since the article on the leading role of the CPCZ was removed from the Constitution, its congresses are considered the internal affair of the party.

A meeting with journalists was held the day before at the CPCZ press center, in which Rudolf Prevratil, spokesman for the Democratic Forum of Communists, took part as well as Josef Hora, head of the press center. The meeting began immediately after the sitting of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium.

Journalists were informed that the Presidium intends to propose to congress delegates that the general secretary of the Central Committee be elected from several candidates by secret ballot, not at an organizational plenum of the Central Committee but directly at the congress. An

interesting statistic was given. Only 18 members of the Central Committee have been elected as delegates to the highest party forum.

The Presidium will be submitting a whole series of other proposals for discussion. In particular, it is proposing to discuss the question of reducing the number of Central Committee members by one-third and forming a 19-member Executive Committee in place of the Central Committee Presidium, setting up a small working secretariat under this Executive Committee. But the main subject of discussion will be the search for ways to get the party out of its serious crisis. Profound mistrust has arisen in the party between its younger members and those who joined the party before 1968, and between ordinary Communists and the party apparatus.

One of the trends that has formed in the party is the Democratic Forum of Communists. In addition to a number of delegates which are its members, the congress is being attended by 50 representatives of the Democratic Forum as guests. They do not have the right to vote, but they can make speeches and statements and nominate candidates to leading party bodies. The Democratic Forum of Communists has issued a statement. It names the main problems which, in the opinion of this organization's supporters, must be discussed at the congress. There are four of them: total renewal of the party leadership and the creation of a completely new apparatus; recognition of the party's responsibility for the crisis in society and discussion of its past policy; explanation of the reasons that have led to deformations in the party and society since 1968; and the drafting of a new CPCZ program. If these conditions are not met, the Democratic Forum of Communists says, its supporters—estimates of their number vary between 50,000 and 100,000—will leave the CPCZ and set up a new party. But a decision on this can only be made after the congress. The Democratic Forum of Communists press center is operating alongside the CPCZ press center in the Palace of Culture, where the extraordinary congress is being held.

The congress was opened by Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. He delivered a report in which he assessed the present state of affairs in the party and society.

He said, in particular:

The CPCZ is in deep crisis, which has provoked a crisis in the whole of society. Our task is to stop this disastrous process and renew the party's ability to take part in reviving our society.

Stalinist deformations are the main cause of this crisis. The essence of these deformations lies in the undemocratic, centralized, administrative-edict system of management, which has paralyzed internal party life and its ability to really resolve the problems of society's development. This has led to the crude deformation of socialist democracy and divided the party and bodies of state and economic management from the people.

We have proclaimed a policy of restructuring, inspired by the implementation of this policy in the Soviet Union. However, paralyzed as it is by deformations, our party has been unable to conduct this policy. Restructuring has not begun inside the party itself and the situation has reached the stage of misinforming not only Communists but all citizens.

A serious situation has also arisen in the economy, where the party and state leadership has been running the show—to the detriment of the future.

Cadre policy methods have had particularly serious consequences. Pseudostability in the cadre sphere and the practice of distributing official positions has led to a situation where some functionaries have not only appropriated lucrative positions in the party and state hierarchy, but have also concentrated considerable power in their own hands. This has given rise to a distinct, fairly narrow, interconnected group which has essentially had uncontrolled power over the decisive levers of management of the party and society. A considerable number of people whose main qualification is obedience have been part of this elite.

In this period of crisis the party is shrinking in size. Since 17 November this year 62,290 people have left the party and 3,478 primary party organizations have disbanded. One consequence of the crisis is that a considerable number of honest people are leaving the CPCZ. The party's program of action after the congress must be consistently based on CPCZ strategy and tactics in the conditions of open political competition for our citizens' trust. This means that we must immediately adapt our activity to these fundamentally different conditions. We must turn our party into a force capable of waging an assertive political struggle. This is extremely important now, when free elections to local and central bodies of authority are being proposed.

We cannot get by without making fundamental structural changes in party organs. Their organizational structure must be flexible and efficient.

We must choose. We must choose our future policy together with the people who will be responsible for putting it into effect. That means choosing the kind of policy and the kind of people that will restore our party to the place where it should always have been: leading the struggle of the working class and all the working people for a happy, free life.

The debates then began.

Former Leaders Expelled

LD2112215789 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 21 TASS—The special congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party continues its deliberations here today. Delegates continue to debate a

draft programme of the Communist Party and adopted an address to former party members expelled in 1968-1969.

The congress decided to expel Vasil Bilak from the party, suspended party membership of Gustav Husak, Lubomir Strougal, and many other former party leaders. The document "Lessons of the Crisis Development in the Party and Society After the 13th Party Congress" was declared invalid.

Karel Urbanek was elected chairman of the party Central Control and Auditing Commission. The congress will end its work late in the evening. The election of a new party Central Committee is its last item on the agenda.

Party Apologizes to Citizens

LD2212002989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; S. Andreyev video report]

[Excerpts] Today in Prague the Extraordinary CPCZ Congress continued its proceedings. [video shows congress in progress]

Late last night, as a matter of fact in the night, the names of the new party leaders became known. The post of general secretary has been abolished. Ladislav Adamec has become the party chairman, and Vasil Mohorita has become the first secretary. He is 37 years old. Until November 1989 he headed the Socialist Youth Union. [video shows them at the congress, the audience applauding] During the November event the union gave its support to the students. It did not lose any popularity. On the contrary, it has gained it. Here is an extract from our interview right before the congress. [video shows Andreyev interviewing Mohorita in a room]

[Begin Mohorita recording, in Czech with superimposed Russian translation] Our party has a future. It has deep traditions. Despite all the problems that our party is now experiencing, despite the deep crisis in our party—not only in the CSSR as a whole but also in the party—I am convinced that we will overcome the crisis. We will overcome it. Most party members are working people, workers, peasants, the intellegentsia, and students. They want the party to take the place in society that belongs to it so that it can enjoy the people's trust. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Among the documents adopted at the congress there is an address to the citizens of the CSSR. The congress has apologized to the citizens of that country for the mistakes committed by the party and stresses that from the public lesson provided by the people in the recent weeks the party will draw the most serious conclusions. It will be resolute in bidding farewell to people who have discredited the title of Communist and will remember that at the focus of politics and of the economy there must be a person with his joys and concerns.

In the evening the elections of the new Central Committee will draw to an end. A party action program will be ratified.

Congress Closes Without Party Split

LD2112234989 Moscow TASS in English 2340 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 22 TASS—The extraordinary congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia ended here late on Thursday. Gloomy predictions of a possible split failed to materialise—this being one of the principal results of two days of stormy and contradictory, but eventually constructive debates.

The congress approved the programme of action of the Communist Party that stressed that the party's aim is to create a socially just, democratic and humane society.

In a secret ballot, delegates elected 140 people to form a new Central Committee and a Central Control-and-Auditing Commission headed by Karel Urbanek.

The congress instructed the Communist Party Central Committee to break off relations with the leadership of the Romanian Communist Party.

The closing address at the congress was made by party Chairman Ladislav Adamec. He stressed the need to begin negotiations with representatives of civic initiatives and other political parties on the possible creation of a left-wing coalition during the period of preparations for the general elections.

Congress Summarized

PM2212122989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 89 Second Edition p5

[PRAVDA special correspondents S. Vtorushin and A. Krushinskiy dispatch: "End of Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Congress"]

[Text] Prague, 21 Dec—Late yesterday evening, delegates to the extraordinary Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] congress elected the leading party bodies. But even in the morning, the stormy discussion as to what kind of structure the CPCZ should have was still going on. The party now has a completely new position in the sociopolitical life of society. From being the leading party, it has become the same as all the rest—not only in a legal sense. Communists no longer have special status in either the government, ministries, national committees, or social organizations. They must now fight for their position in a real struggle with real rivals.

During the discussion of procedural issues, congress delegates proposed the abolition of the office of CPCZ Central Committee general secretary and the introduction in its place of the posts of party chairman and first secretary of the Central Committee. Speaking at a press

conference in the evening, Vasil Mohorita, member of the congress working presidium, explained this move as follows.

The CPCZ will now have to cooperate closely with other parties and social organizations in the solution of any sociopolitical problem. The party chairman will be responsible for these matters. The first secretary will be responsible for all internal party affairs.

Ladislav Adamec, a prominent party and state figure in the CSSR, was elected CPCZ chairman by secret ballot from four nominated candidates. Until 7 December this year he held the post of chairman of the federal government and was a member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium. Even before the events of 17 November, Ladislav Adamec began a direct dialogue with the opposition, which prompted strong dissatisfaction among the former party leadership. Ladislav Adamec advocates the acceleration of economic reform and the restructuring of the national economy. At the regional party conferences which elected the congress delegates, L. Adamec was nominated for the post of president.

The congress abolished the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium. It has been replaced by a Political Executive Committee. A Central Committee Secretariat has been formed to take charge of routine work. Vasil Mohorita has been elected first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. Until the end of November, he held the post of chairman of the Socialist Youth Union Central Committee. At the November plenum, V. Mohorita was elected member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

The congress delegates unanimously abolished the present CPCZ statute. A new statute will be adopted at the next congress. For the present, Communists will be guided by a so-called provisional organizational procedure. It is markedly different from the old statute. In particular, there is now no need to undergo a period as a candidate member in order to become a full party member. The limit on tenure in elected office is also being removed. The existence of different platforms and trends within the party is now recognized.

The congress discussed the question of whether the Czech Socialist Republic should have its own party. As is well known, this kind of party already exists in the Slovak Socialist Republic. The majority of delegates reached the opinion that first of all the attitude to this problem should be ascertained in primary organizations and that the final decision should be adopted at the next congress.

The question of the newspaper RUDE PRAVO was discussed as a special item on the agenda. It is no longer subordinate to the Central Committee and is now the organ of the whole party. It has been decided to include representatives of regional party organizations in the editorial collegium in addition to the editorial leadership.

One particular theme came across as the main idea in the delegates' speeches: What must be done to regain the party's authority and win back the masses of working people who have recently become disillusioned with its policy? Delegate Emil Kasl demanded that the party make a decisive break with everyone who has used their high office to their own selfish ends. He expressed lack of confidence in the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium because, in the complex political situation, it has been slow to react or has not reacted at all to many questions. Pavel Minarik from Prague, who spoke after him, said that the blame for the crisis in the party rests not only with the former leadership but with all communists.

Many spoke of the need to preserve the party's unity, restore its militancy, and win young people over to its side. Petr Kubu from Branna [name as transliterated], for example, said that if the CPCZ really wants to become a progressive party again and regain people's trust, not only must it not lose contact with young workers—it must not lose contact with young students either.

A great deal was said about the need to democratize internal party life and restructure the entire system of political and agitation work, as well as the need for competition within the party itself. In particular, the congress decided that every party organization has the right to nominate its own candidate to the party Central Committee.

Two documents were adopted at the end of the first working day of the congress: The first was an address to citizens of the CSSR, in which the congress apologized for the events of 17 November and decisively dissociated itself from those members who had anything whatsoever to do with these events.

The second document was an open letter to Romanian Communists. It said, in particular, that the congress delegates are deeply shocked by the events in the city of Timisoara, which conflict with the humanist ideals of socialism. We believe, the letter said, that you will understand why we condemn these events, which run counter to the interests of your own people.

In the middle of the second working day, the congress adopted the main document after a long, stormy discussion: the party's action program "For a Democratic, Socialist Society in the CSSR." It says, in part: We are in favor of transforming the CPCZ into a modern political party which can become part of the democratic movement of European left-wing forces. The CPCZ is in favor of creating a democratic, socialist society in which real people's power will be guaranteed. We reject misguided concepts on the CPCZ's leading role. Instead of this, we want to gain trust and authority in society. We are in favor of complete freedom of thought, spiritual and cultural creativity, and exchange of information and support freedom of views, beliefs, and religion. The CPCZ is decisively opposed to any attempts to secure a monopoly in these spheres.

The party sees the struggle for social justice as the basis for uniting with the people. Consequently, it will struggle to create the conditions necessary for fully realizing people's creative abilities.

We are in favor of full equality for all forms of ownership, while retaining the decisive role of social ownership. We are opposed to social ownership being returned to private hands. We want the Czechoslovak economy to be broadly opened to the whole world and to have broad access to the European market, which is a necessary condition of building a common European home.

The CPCZ will deepen cooperation with other communist parties, the parties of the Socialist International, and all left-wing and democratic movements and forces in the world.

Ladislav Adamec, chairman of the CPCZ, gave the closing speech at the congress. At this point, the congress concluded its work.

Gorbachev Greets New CPCZ Leaders

PM2212100589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev undated message to new Czechoslovak Communist Party leaders]

[Text] To Comrade Ladislav Adamec, chairman of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ]

To Comrade Vasil Mohorita, first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee

Esteemed comrades!

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and myself, I cordially congratulate you on your election to the top leadership posts in the CPCZ.

I am confident that the CPCZ, relying on the rich traditions of the socialist workers movement and having put forward a modern action program, will make an active contribution to Czechoslovakia's democratic renewal.

Comradely greetings,

M. Gorbachev

'Prague Spring' Figure Mlynar on USSR Visit

PM2112121189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with Z. Mlynar, Czechoslovak political figure associated with the drafting of the political program of the 1968 Prague Spring reforms, by unidentified PRAVDA correspondent; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] Z. Mlynar, a political figure of the "Prague spring" of 1968 who at that time was secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee and is now a political scientist and a professor at Innsbruck University in Austria, visited Moscow 12-19 December at the invitation of the Soviet Association of Political Sciences and the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University. He delivered lectures at Moscow State University, the Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System, and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law; visited the editorial offices of a number of Soviet journals; talked with political and social figures on problems of restructuring in the USSR and other socialist countries; and attended a session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Before his departure Prof Mlynar answered a TASS correspondent's questions.

[Correspondent] You are well-known in our country as one of the authors of the political program of the 1968 "Prague Spring." How do you view the events of the 1989 "Prague Fall"?

[Mlynar] As in 1968, the aim of the current protest by students and working people broadly supporting them is to overcome the Stalinist-type economic and political system which is not viable and which is a brake on social progress. As for the forms and motive forces of this process, there are important differences here. Nevertheless, transformations have long been imminent in Czechoslovakia. And even though the first attempt to implement them in 1968 was stopped by force, the basic aims of the "Prague spring" remain relevant. I hope that now the ideals of democracy and human rights, humanism, and social justice, for which we struggled, will become an inalienable feature of Czechoslovak development.

[Correspondent] You haven't been to the USSR for over 21 years, but your Russian is absolutely impeccable. How has your trip been, and will you continue to maintain contacts with our country?

[Mlynar] I have had a host of interesting meetings and seen many interesting things in Moscow. It may be said that to some extent they even surpassed my expectations. In particular, accords were reached on the publication of some of my writings in Russian and on the maintenance of links with Soviet scientists and social figures.

GDR, FRG Groups Propose Cooperation Conference

PM2112123789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 16

[TASS report: "GDR: Joint Proposal"]

[Text] It is essential to formulate common European norms to ensure equitable economic and cultural cooperation between East and West. Such a proposal has been addressed to the governments of all countries signatory to the Helsinki Final Act by representatives of a number of political parties and public organizations of the GDR, the FRG, and West Berlin. They have proposed holding a special conference in the GDR capital and in West Berlin.

During a news conference held in Berlin, the action group of the organizations—Strategy for Modern Socialism, Democratic Breakthrough, and the Alternative List—stressed that the proposed forum should define, in particular, the status of Western capital investments in Eastern Europe and a draw up a statute on the creation of joint enterprises where there is full recognition of the political, economic, and cultural sovereignty of the countries in which those enterprises are situated.

GDR, FRG Social Democratic Parties Meet

PM2112142389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 16

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under the general heading "GDR and FRG: Politics and Economics"]

[Text] Berlin—The first official meeting between representatives of the GDR's new Social Democratic Party and the Social Democratic Party of Germany (FRG) has been held in Berlin. After the meeting I. Beme [name as transliterated], secretary of the Social Democratic Party, and H.J. Vogel, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, had a meeting with journalists. They said that it has been decided to form a parity contact commission; the representatives of the two parties will, in turn, chair the commission.

The West German Social Democrats have promised to help their fellow-thinkers in the GDR with the election campaign. Various equipment, including office equipment, will be sent here. I. Beme said he rules out the possibility of a coalition with the Socialist Unity Party of Germany; it had been rumored the day before that such a coalition was in the cards. The party regards H. Modrow's cabinet as an interim government whose actions must be supported in the interests of stability in the country.

There has been an appeal from Leipzig to "worthily conclude the demonstration of fall 1989" next Monday. The appeal comes from representatives of local democratic organizations and the church. They have requested that those who come to the demonstration do not bring banners and placards with them but candles instead: The demonstration will be dedicated to the memory of the victims of Stalinism in the GDR.

Albanian Amnesty for 20 Percent of Convicts

PM2212114589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Amnesty in Albania"]

[Text] Tirana, 19 Dec—In accordance with the 13 November 1989 amnesty decree in Albania issued by the Presidium of the Albanian People's Assembly, 20.4 percent of all the country's convicts have been pardoned and released. This was announced by Rrapo Mino, Albanian prosecutor general, in an interview in ZERI I POPULLIT.

The people released include all convicts aged under 18 on 20 November, the day the decree went into force. They are pardoned regardless of the gravity of their crimes and the sentence passed by the court.

According to the decree, people who have committed the most serious crimes against the state are not to be released, nor are those who stole socialist property or citizens' goods.

The people released under the amnesty have returned to their old homes. The government has given specific instructions that they should all be found work, the Albanian prosecutor general stated.

Yazov Greets Yugoslav Counterpart

PM2212115389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[USSR Defense Minister Yazov's undated message to SFRY's Kadijevic on Yugoslav People's Army anniversary]

[Text] To Colonel General Comrade Veljko Kadijevic, SFRY federal secretary for national defense

Esteemed Comrade Federal Secretary!

On the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the Yugoslav People's Army, I send you and all the Yugoslav servicemen, on behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and myself personally, ardent greetings and the most cordial congratulations.

We express the firm belief that the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation which link our people and armies will continue to develop successfully in the interests of strengthened peace and socialism.

I wish you and the entire personnel of the Yugoslav People's Army further successes in strengthening the SFRY's defense capability.

[Signed] Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense

West Europe

Sweden To Expel Soviet Businessman for Spying

LD2112223489 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1030 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] A Soviet company representative hs spied against Sweden, and will be expelled from the country, the Swedish news agency reports. The person in question, who does not have diplomatic immunity, tried to obtain information on Swedish and foreign technolgoy, and on Swedish industrial and military operations. It has been assessed that the operations have not damaged Swedish interests, but would risk doing so if allowed to continue, a government statement says.

The government was informed 2 days ago by the National Police Board about the matter, but no one in the government wants to comment further.

Shevardnadze UK, Belgian Visit Assessed

LD2112202589 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—The agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Community signed by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Brussels on December 18 lays down a solid legal basis for the Soviet Union's relations with each of the 12 member countries of the European Community, said Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Ernest Obminskiy [title as received] at a news conference here today.

Obminskiy said that under the agreement the communities grant most favoured nation status to the Soviet Union.

In addition, the agreement approximates the conditions existing in the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. He said this document sets an example for a commercial agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Ambassador Yuriy Deryabin, chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Directorate for Security and Cooperation in Europe, emphasised that the Brussels meeting between Shevardnadze and NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner, a meeting without precedent, is in the framework of changes taking place in Europe and the Soviet Union.

He said that in view of the role of the military-political alliances in changing Europe, a dialogue with NATO is necessary.

Touching upon the results of the visit to London, Valeriy Krasnov, deputy chief of the Second European Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, said that Shevardnadze's conversations with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Douglas Hurd made possible a new level of relations between the two countries, a new state of the political dialogue.

They touched upon a broad range of questions, among them those concerning nuclear weapons.

The meeting may be the beginning of a new dialogue with Britain about the problem of minimal nuclear deterrence as a useful phenomenon of European and world security at the present stage.

The head of the British Government was told that the Soviet Union believes this new stage would provide a transition to a non-nuclear world.

Krasnov announced that a Soviet parliamentary delegation, headed by a member of the Soviet leadership, is to visit London in the second half of next year. The minister of state of the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office is expected in Moscow in January. The British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs is to arrive for an official visit in the Soviet Union in April. The "British Festival" is to be held in Kiev early in June. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is expected to attend the festival. There are plans for Margaret Thatcher's meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev.

Commentary on Soviet-EC Trade Agreement

LD2112000489 Moscow TASS in English 2121 GMT 19 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov:

The agreement between the Soviet Union and the European communities on trade and commercial and economic cooperation signed in Brussels on Monday is a document the importance of which can hardly be overestimated.

The agreement crowns prolonged and difficult negotiations of the two sides which became possible due to a joint statement of the CMEA and the economic communities on the establishment of official relations signed in Luxembourg in June 1988.

The agreement opens broad prospects for the development of East-West relations.

For its scope, the agreement is without precedent in the history of the European communities' international ties. It comprises many important areas—scientific and technological cooperation, the production of consumer goods, trade development, interaction in the area of safety of nuclear reactors, etc.

It reflects the processes taking place in Europe and thus confirms the conclusion drawn by Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush during their summit off Malta that the cold war is over and that the period of peaceful development has set in.

The Brussels agreement will open the Soviet market to West European businessmen and will lift virtually all restrictions on Soviet goods imposed by the European communities.

The agreement will help improve the economic situation in the Soviet Union and hence, will promote perestroika.

In the West, specifically in the European communities, there are statements in favour of the success of perestroika and of the Soviet Union's integration in the international economic system.

The document will give an impetus to the efforts for the construction of the economic foundation of a common European home. It will stimulate the creation of a new economic order in Europe. In the political sense it will undoubtedly promote East-West rapprochement.

Nevertheless, the agreement does not remove some barriers placed by the United States and its allies to business cooperation between East and West.

The coordinating committee on export controls (Cocom) bans the sales of high-tech equipment to the Soviet Union and other East European countries.

And though the governments of countries of the European communities are more prepared than the United States to revise the role of Cocom and its lists of goods prohibited for sale, as the present processes in Europe make Cocom [an], anachronism, discriminatory restrictions on trade with socialist countries remain.

The main reason for this state of affairs is distrust and fears that the latest Western technology might be used to the detriment of the West's security.

Perhaps this attitude explains the recent statement by U.S. Secretary of Commerce Robert Mosbacher that strategic considerations will still dominate the U.S. plans of easing restrictions on trade with the USSR in some degree.

These fears will be dispelled if the West accepts Moscow's invitation for an inspection of Western specialists to the Soviet territory, if the Cocom system is eliminated.

The inspection will clear any suspicions that some or other equipment was used in suspect purposes.

if this proposal is accepted it will lead to economic advantages and will also have a positive effect on East-West relations in a political sense. It will lead to the atmosphere of confidence.

A regular Cocom session to be held in February 1990 offers to the West a good opportunity to show the readiness to build its relations with the east on the principles of confidence.

FRG Social Democrats Adopt New Program

PM2112125389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Zyubanov dispatch: "New Program for the Social Democratic Party"]

[Text] West Berlin, 20 Dec—The Congress of the FRG's largest opposition party—the Social Democratic Party [SPD]—which was held here over 3 days, has come to an end. Its 400 delegates adopted a new party program which replaced the Godesberg program of 1959 and outlined the main landmarks for West German Social Democrats in the 21st century.

In an outstanding improvised speech yesterday Oscar Lafontaine, deputy chairman of the SPD, stressed the main points of the new program, which was elaborated under his direct leadership. The conclusion that mankind's global problems cannot be resolved by individual states is new to the program, he said,

The SPD program statement adopted by the congress entitled "Germans in Europe" says that European unity and German unity are closely interconnected. One cannot be achieved at the expense of the other. All manner of talk about the reunification of the reich within the 1937 borders and some kind of "special German path" blocks European unity and German unity. European and German interests require unconditional recognition of Poland's western border.

Advancing toward a new Europe, the SPD intends to develop closer cooperation with the GDR in the sphere of politics, economics, environmental conservation, cultural exchange, and disarmament. Moreover, all this must take place within the framework of contractual cooperation between the FRG and the GDR, which may become a confederation in the future. The SPD permits the emergence of a German confederation at the end of this century even, provided the two military blocs are still in existence.

The program's foreign policy section demanded that the policy based on the military threat be replaced by a system of collective security, that mass-destruction weapons be eliminated, and the armed forces be cut drastically.

The way to this, the Social Democrats believe, lies through the phased unilateral reduction of military potentials and the lessening of military budgets.

The SPD will also strive to create nuclear and chemical weapons-free zones in Europe.

Latin America & Caribbean

Akhromeyev Denies USSR Okayed Panama Attack

LD2112200989 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] The military adviser of the Soviet president, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, has refuted the allegations that the U.S. intervention into Panama ensues from a secret U.S.-Soviet arrangement. When a Radio Moscow reporter asked the marshal to comment on the recent report that under a secret agreement reached during the Malta summit Washington will respect the Soviet Union's interests in Europe and this country the United States' interests in Latin America, Sergey Akhromeyev dismissed the reports as slanderous and stated that nothing of this sort had been agreed upon in Malta.

Bessmertynkh Receives Envoy With Bush Statement

LD2112180289 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on Wednesday received the U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, Jack Matlock, at his request.

The ambassador handed over the text of President George Bush's statement justifying the U.S. military action in Panama.

In the conversation, the Soviet official resolutely demanded that the intervention, which violates the U.N. Charter and standards of international relations, be terminated, and the American troops be immediately withdrawn from the territory of the sovereign state.

Peace Committee Condemns U.S. Panama 'Invasion'

LD2112222989 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—The Soviet Peace Committee has condemned the U.S. invasion of Panama and demanded that an end be put to the bloodshed and violence there, that Panama's sovereignty and independence be respected.

The Committee released a statement today noting that the Panama Canal was closed to shipping for the first time in its history.

It calls on the American people, on all U.S. anti-war organisations and movements to do everything in their power to stop the hostilities in Panama immediately and to contribute a peaceful settlement of the crisis. It also urged the Soviet Government to help call an urgent meeting of the Security Council to discuss the situation in the Panama Canal Zone.

TASS Reports Cheney TV Interview on Panama

LD2112201589 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 21 TASS—The United States will remain in Panama as long as needed, U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney told the CBS TV Network today.

According to the Pentagon boss, some 9,000 troops were airlifted to Panama in addition to the 12,000-13,000 men permanently stationed in the Panama Canal Zone.

However, the U.S. mass media mentioned a higher figure: They said that about 24,000 U.S. troops are now in Panama.

Cheney left no doubt that U.S. troops would not leave Panama until a government docile to the United States is secured in the country.

He said that the United States wants to be sure that the situation is under control and that the new Panamanian Government, a "democratic government", firmly holds power.

He added that the U.S. could achieve this goal, to a great extent, with the forces permanently stationed in Panama. But the United States will not withdraw the airlifted troops until the administration is sure that the situation is under control, he noted.

Cheney said that the U.S. intends to continue a hunt for General Noreiga and to bring him to court.

Continuing Operations in Panama Reported

LD2112210789 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Panama City December 21 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

The U.S. Dignity Volunteer Battalions, loyal to General Noriega, are operating. Units of the Panamanian National Defence forces (NDF) left the city in an organised way and retreated to mountains.

U.S. paratroopers backed by tanks and helicopters occupied ministries, government offices, banks, key facilities of power supply and communications and sealed off embassies. Electricity is cut off to some residential areas, and there is a shortage of water and food in the city.

Looting was wide-spread in the capital throughout the night. Since police were absent, looters ransacked shops and private homes. Americans are shifting two military police battalions to the city.

The roar of tanks and armoured carriers fills the capital's streets, dozens of helicopters are hovering over the city, jets are diving on houses and refuelling stations and cars are ablaze. This is how the invaders are trying to cause panic among the local population.

Only the TV and radio stations of the U.S. South Command are operating in the country. Troops loyal to General Noriega use only small mobile radio stations which broadcast for a short time to transmit important reports from the government which went underground. They are constantly jammed by special U.S. installations.

U.S. troops regularly comb Panama streets and search houses under the pretext of looking for General Noriega. His residence was subjected to heavy aerial bombing. U.S. aviation also bombed Panamanian Air Force bases in Panama City suburbs and in the country's provinces.

Americans arrested three journalists in Fort Clayton community, representing the FRANCE PRESSE, EFE and NOTIMEX News Agencies. They were interrogated, and their photo and cine films were spoiled. Then they were released.

This morning a U.S. tank fired with a machinegun on a group of foreign journalists who stood at the entrance to the Marriott Hotel. One of them was wounded.

U.S. Ambassador to Panama Arthur Davis spoke on Radio of the South Command. He said that the situation in Panama is complicated, admitting that Noriega's troops continue resistance.

According to unofficial reports, the U.S. aggression claimed the lives of between 200 and 500 Panamanians. About 3,000 are wounded. The Santo Tomas Hospital in

Panama City where Panamanian and International Red Cross teams work, is packed with the wounded and the dead.

According to eye-witnesses, there are not enough people to carry corpses to morgues or for burial, and they lie at the hosptial's backyard in the scorching sun.

Canal Reopens for Daytime Shipping

LD2112210189 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Panama City December 21 TASS—The Panama Canal, closed on Wednesday after the U.S. armed intervention, is again open for shipping during daytime, says a report circulated today by the Panama Canal Commission.

It is expected that dozens of ships will pass this important waterway even today, the report says. It is planned that around-the-clock navigation will be restored by the weekend.

Over 13,000 ships annually pass the 80-kilometer canal. Under the 1903 treaty, the United States received the Panama Canal Zone without time limitation for the construction and operation of the canal.

Its construction ended in 1914. The U.S.-Panamanian treaties signed in 1977 provide for the restoration of Panama's full sovereignty over the canal.

Correspondents Killed, Wounded

LD2112222489 Moscow TASS in English 2121 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Panama City December 21 TASS—Not only innocent citizens but also foreign journalists accredited to this country fall victims of the U.S. invasion of Panama.

The EFE news agency reports that Juan Antonio Rodriguez, a Spanish photographer who worked for Madrid's EL PAIS newspaper died in Panama City today. His body was identified at the city morgue among numerous other corpses brought there.

Earlier, a U.S. tank fired with a machinegun on a group of foreign reporters who stood at the entrance to the Marriott Hotel in Panama City. One of them was wounded.

Americans detained three journalists representing the France Presse, EFE and NOTIMEX news agencies in Fort Clayton community. They were interrogated, and their photo and cine films were spoiled. After that they were released.

Eye-witnesses saw a man lying with a cine camera in hand in a central street of Panama City, where there were clashes between U.S. troops and volunteer battalions loyal to General Noriega.

Nicaraguans Surround U.S. Embassy in Managua

LD2112233989 Moscow TASS in English 2329 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Managua December 22 TASS—Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto announced the decision to place army units around the U.S. Embassy in Managua in response to U.S. troops surrounding the Nicaraguan Embassy in Panama.

The minister said the U.S. Administration would bear all the responsibility for the consequences of this retaliatory measure. Reports from Panama say that the embassies of Nicaragua and Cuba were encircled by American Rangers alleging General Noriega was hiding there.

Commentary on U.S. Actions in Panama

TASS' Chigir on 'Aggression'

LD2112180189 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 21 Dec 89

["U.S. Aggression Against Panama—TASS Comment"]

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS Political News Analyst Nikolay Chigir:

The U.S. armed invasion of Panama has provoked a worldwide outcry. Those governments, statesmen and public leaders who consistently uphold the principles of a people's free choice, and the sovereignty and independence of states explicitly condemned Washington's actions as a gross violation of the fundamental principles of international law and the U.N. Charter.

Meetings of the U.N. Security Council, the coordination bureau of non-aligned countries and the emergency session of the Standing Council of the Organisation of American States leave no doubts that the world community flatly rejects the power tactics used by the U.S. to settle inter-state conflicts.

The mass media state that the actions of the U.S. Administration in Panama are totally at variance with new thinking in international relations and may hamper positive processes in the world arena.

The difference between Soviet and U.S. positions is also noted. While the Soviet Union rejects interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the British ITN TV company stresses, the United States demonstrates to the entire world its inability to avoid bloodshed when pursuing its political aims.

Judging by reaction to the anti-Panamanian actions taken by the U.S., Washington's attempts to convince the American and world public that these actions "are fully in accordance with international law" and that the United States "has an inherent right of self-defense" under the U.N. Charter are futile.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, who made these statements, could not justify them. His reference to an

"intelligence report that General Noriega was considering launching an urban commando attack on American citizens in a residential neighbourhood" does not stand up to criticism.

Even Baker stressed what amounts to doubts regarding this "report", saying that he cannot prove that it "was absolutely reliable."

The "arguements", circulated by the White House and the State Department to justify the aggression, do not mislead anyone. How seriously can one take their statements about the need to apprehend General Noriega, the "criminal"? The charge is only based on a decision by one of the American district courts. The accusation has yet to be substantiated.

One can imagine what kind of place the world will become, if the ruling of a court in one country can give just cause for armed aggression against another country.

No matter how the administration characterises its action, it amounts to a military invasion of Panama, admits American ABC TV Network. Few people have doubts that the main goal of the action is to revise the U.S.-Panama Canal Treaties in order to perpetuate U.S. control over the canal and the American military bases on Panamanian territory.

Vladimir Chernyshev Commentary

LD2112182389 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] [Announcer] What is the response in the Soviet Union to the military operation the United States launched in Panama on Wednesday? The Soviet Foreign Ministry has described the action as intervention in violation of the United Nations Charter. The intervention must be stopped immediately, says the ministry statement. Our reporter asked a Soviet news agency TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Chernyshev to comment on the events in Panama, and this is what the observer said by telephone to our office:

[Begin Chernyshev recording in Russian, fading into English translation] The armed invasion of Panama by the United States doubtlessly evokes a feeling of deep anxiety in our country, and we believe that the world community must denounce this U.S. action and demand its end. This is not just an act of frank aggression against a sovereign country, which is a full and equal member of the United Nations; I would call this action a challenge to all the nations of the world. The United States has opposed itself to the world community; it has violated elementary standards of conduct by states on the international arena, and has acted contrary to the general human interests. In this case, Washington tramples on the UN Charter and defies generally recognized norms of international law.

As I see it, it is particularly disturbing that this action has been taken at a time when new political thinking is spreading more and more widely around the world, but in this case we again can see gunboat diplomacy, using which the United States has been trying for decades to turn the Latin American countries into its backyard. I think that no arguments hold water. (?The) so-called arguments the White House resorts to to justify its military action against Panama—this is actually a set of (?former) stereotype formulas with which the United States repeatedly covered up its armed intervention against its southern neighbors, including Grenada in 1983. Just as then the White House claims now that the military action has been taken to protect U.S. citizens and to restore the democratic process in the country. Even such reasoning is used as the need to remove the Panamanian leader General Antonio Noriega, and to protect the security of the Panama Canal. I believe this is just a propaganda coverup, which is used to delude the public both in the United States itself and in other countries.

The main thing is this; who in general gives the right to the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, and by armed force at that? It is pointed out in many international documents, including the Declaration of the Principles of International Law, the UN General Assembly adopted back in 1970, that no state or group of states have the right to interfere directly or indirectly for any reason in the internal or external affairs of another state. But, as we can see, the U.S. Administration assumes that this generally accepted principle does not necessarily affect its policy. How is it possible to talk of peace, of any new thinking, if any state uses its armed forces against other countries the way the United States is doing? Clearly the armed intervention in Panama is not just another regional conflict—it also endangers the balance that it has been possible to achieve on the international scene. I think this too should be taken into account. [end recording]

Vladislav Kozyakov Commentary

LD2212002389 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov]

[Text] The dispatch of thousands of U.S. troops to Panama and the military action against the Panamanian Army and the people is causing much concern. There have been casualties on both sides. The United States jeopardized universal humanitarian values by launching the intervention. It dealt a blow to the universal principle of international discourse according to which the use of force in international relations, or threats to use force, is unacceptable. The U.S. ambassador, Thomas Pickering, told the United Nations yesterday that the United States acted in self-defense, in keeping with article 51 of the UN Charter. That reference is wrong. Article 51 permits individual or collective defense in the event of an armed attack on a UN member. Neither the decision of the National Assembly of Panama on a state of war with the United States nor the incidents in Panama last weekend constitute an armed attack on the

United States warranting self-defense in the form of armed invasion of another country.

The U.S. Administration said that it acted in defense of democracy. There are no provisions in the UN Charter or any other international documents that permit the use of armed force to invade another country and unseat its government. This runs counter to international law. That the United States does not accept the Panamanian leader, General Noriega, is not the only such case.

There are countries ruled by criminals, for instance racist regimes, in the world today. They are condemned, and sanctions against them are introduced, but armed interventions into them to topple these regimes are against international law, as is the U.S.' self-assumed mission to restore democracy in Panama.

Over the past 150 years, the United States used armed force against the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean on [word indistinct] occasions. Its first invasion of Panama went ahead 80 years ago. It intervened in Grenada in 1983. This seems to have all been relegated to the past. Now, now that important changes are underway around the world and many countries have condemned their own actions of that kind in the past, foreign interventions come as reminders of the tragic periods of history.

There was hope only 2 days ago that the UN Charter is assured of strong support and that international relations are becoming more civilized as new thinking extends to Europe and the rest of the world. The U.S. action casts doubt on that hope.

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev 22 Dec Remarks on Romanian Developments

LD2212132389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 22 Dec 89

[From a report on the 22 December session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in Moscow]

[Text] Toward the end of today's morning session, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev acquainted people's deputies of the USSR with new information about the events in Romania.

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Comrades, this information adds to the morning reports about the development of events in Romania. Major Bucharest industrial and transport enterprises suspended work in the morning of 22 December. Columns of workers and students moved in an organized fashion toward the city center. When passing by the Soviet Embassy they shouted the slogans: The Army is with us; the people are with us.

The inhabitants of the capital greeted demonstrators on their march. Approximately 500,000 people have gathered in the city center according to estimates. Firing could be heard.

Demonstrations were noted in the cities of Brasov, Arad, and other localities. The situation became exacerbated in the middle of the day. A presidential decree proclaimed a state of emergency in the whole of the country's territory at 1100—1200 Moscow time. The proclamation of the decree was followed by a report that Milea, Romania's defense minister, acting like a traitor, ended his life by comitting suicide. It is noted that soldiers are beginning to abandon the cordons they had been maintaining.

Subunits of militia and special detachments remain on the spot. Protection of official residences has been stepped up. They are being patrolled from the air by helicopters. An operations command headquarters has been set up at the unversity. This is the way the events are developing. [end recording]

Congress Issues Statement on Romania

LD2212091389 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

"The Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR expresses grave concern in connection with reports about the dramatic events in Romania which have led to human casualties. This arouses a feeling of profound regret. We hope that ways will be found urgently in Romania to solve the existing problems peacefully and in the spirit of tolerance, humanism and respect of human rights".

The document was adopted by a majority vote of 1,809 deputies. thirty-two deputies voted against and 65 abstained.

The statement was adopted today after President Mikhail Gorbachev, who chaired today's morning meeting, said that according to information received from the Soviet Embassy in Romania, the situation in that country had deteriorated seriously in the course of last night.

The appeal was supported by Aleksandr Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the International Affairs committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other deputies who took the floor.

Gorbachev Remarks on Panama, Romania, Lithuania

LD2112201889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Address by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Mikhail Gorbachev at the 21 December evening session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded; from the "Vremya" program]

[Text] The speeches are giving food for thought in different ways. I do not intend to comment upon them. At the deputies' wish, I will answer the questions on Panama; the events in Romania; and on another theme, an internal one, which I will also touch upon.

The U.S. Armed Forces' invasion of Panama is meeting with growing condemnation. Such condemnation has already come in particular from the majority of countries in Latin America, from Yugoslavia, Spain, and China. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs has declared that the use of force always gives cause for regret, and cannot be justified. Discussion of this question continues in the Security Council.

Today the Soviet Government released a statement on this question. Perhaps you have already heard it. Those of you who have not heard it, listen to it or read it. It is a serious statement.

As for the events in Romania, comrade deputies, particularly from Moldavia, are insisting that we react to them at the congress. However, in order to react to something, one must have information, trustworthy information, in order, on the basis of that information, to adopt—trustworthy information—to assume the correct stance and make asessments. Yesterday, immediately, we commissioned the ambassador to Romania, our ambassador, Comrade Tyazhelnikov, to ask and apply to the leadership of the country and...[pauses] in order that the country's leadership give him the relevant information.

Here we invited the Romanian ambassador to the Foreign Ministry in order to put these same questions to him, and to receive information. So far, the information which we have from Bucharest, and here from the Romanian ambassador, does not allow us to form a real

picture of what is happening in the country. You know that the foreign press is reporting the situation in dramatic tones, but so far, what we have received from our ambassador in Romania does not confirm this, and we have commissioned him to continue his work in order to present to the Congress of People's Deputies detailed and objective information on the situation. Then we will determine how to react.

That is two questions. Further more, I received in the first half of the day several such appeals, signed by tens of deputies-communists. I will read one of them:

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich. The Communist Party of Lithuania's secession from the CPSU is a sad fact for all communists in the country. Evidently it marks a new round of separatist moods in the country, a new huge danger for the CPSU and our multiethnic state. Anxiety is growing. A chain reaction has begun. In our opinion, in these conditions a meeting of the Central Committee leadership with communist people's deputies would be useful. First-hand information is needed. Coordinated actions are needed. In any event, there is no pretending that nothing has happened. If for any reason there cannot be such a meeting, then we will await other actions which would help us all to get to the bottom of things. I am very disturbed.

There are many signatures here, on both sides. I want to say that we share the people's deputies-communists' concern and anxiety concerning the initial information we have received in Moscow. We do not yet have any official announcements, neither the report nor the decisions adopted. We hope we will receive them. However, we do have information which coincides with what the comrades write about.

Today, in the middle of the day, the Politburo sat to discuss this question, and we decided in the next few days to present the question for discussion at a Party Central Committee plenum.

On that comrades we end the evening sitting of the congress.

Gorbachev Opens 21 Dec Congress Session

LD2112175189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1302 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Opening remarks by Mikhail S. Gorbachev at the Second Congress of People's Deputies 21 December session in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] We are running virtually 1 and ½ days behind the timetable approved by the congress. [passage omitted]

In light of the current situation, the following proposal is presented for implementing the congress' timetable: On the remaining days, to work through to 2000 instead of 1900, and to declare Saturday and Sunday [23 and 24 December] working days. This makes it possible to end the congress on Sunday around 1400 or 1500. [passage omitted]

If these proposals are supported, then I can go on to propose the specific agenda. [Video shows deputies voting] [passage omitted]

As the proposal has been supported, the specific agenda, comrade deputies, for our future work could look like this. I present this proposal:

Today, to continue the discussion of the law on the status of people's deputies until 1100. [passage omitted]

From 1100 to 1400, with a break of course, to listen to a report on the draft law on the constitutional compliance bill in the USSR and begin discussion of it.

From 1600, after the dinner break, we could begin discussion of and voting on the vote on the law on the status of people's deputies, aimed at completely examining this question by the end of the day.

Friday, 22 December. Before dinner, it's possible to complete discussion of the draft law on constitutional compliance, adopt this law, and carry out elections to the committee for constitutional compliance. At 1600 we could begin examining the question of intensifying the fight against crime, listen to Comrades Bakatin and Sukharev's reports, and then begin discussion of them. That's on 22 December.

Saturday, 23 December. The complete examination of the issue of the fight against crime by 1400. And at 1600 begin listening to and discussing the reports by the commissions set up by the congress.

Sunday, 24 December, to continue this work to complete all of the work by 1400 or 1500, as has already been stated. [passage omitted]

Concerning the meeting of the Supreme Soviet, in our opinion it could then be held on Monday, 25 December from 1200. [passage omitted]

Further Gorbachev Speech

LD2112143189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairing the 21 December morning session of the Second Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I wish to make a small report, prior to commencement of debate. It seems to me that those who listened attentively to the speech of the rapporteur, Comrade Kerimov, and who are also familiar with, remember, and drew attention to the discussion we had on these questions when we were passing the agenda, all this has shown that there exist certain opinions, viewpoints, different interpretations, and perhaps even a lack of understanding. In my view, the rapporteur tried to react

to this and to set out additional arguments in favor, both of having these documents debated and passed.

The debates will now begin. Comrades, I would ask you to ponder and assess two situations; and this pertains, first and foremost, to those who will be taking the floor. The first situation is this: We change nothing, leaving everything as it is; that is to say we throw these points out and we work, as has hitherto been the case, without the Committee for Constitutional Supervision and without an appropriate law on this question. That is to say, we have a Constitution that is in force, Article 74 is in force, proclaiming that the laws of the USSR have the same force on the territory of all Union Republics; in cases where republican law diverges from the All-Union law, it is the USSR law that is in force. Everything is clear. Article 119 is in force. In accordance with this Article, Paragraph 5, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium exercises control over the observance of the USSR Constitution and ensures that the Union Republican laws are in keeping both with the USSR Constitution and the USSR laws. The supreme Soviet presidium has availed itself of this right and this includes the recent time when situations requiring decision emerged. Thus, we have the Constitution, we have the norms which establish the relationship between the Constitution and even the Union laws and the legislative acts of Republics; we have a mechanism to exercise control over it, over the observance of the Constitution. This is in the first place.

How do we act in this case, in this situation? In the same way in which we have acted to date. However, following the debate on the third point on the agenda and the adoption of a decision—and let me remind you that it is only within the framework of this point that we have adopted a relevant solution, since the decision is not just what pertains to the changes in Chapter 13 regarding the electoral system, but we also adopted a decision making it incumbent on the Supreme Soviet to speed up the preparations for examining the Law on Ownership, Land, and so forth, on the demarcation of powers of the center and the Union, and apart from that there was also there Point 3, it seems, or Chapter Three, point 3, since we adopted an independent decision, where there is an instruction to the Constitutional Commission to carry out relevant work, and I will not set out the content. So, to what has existed so far are added big opportunities and preconditions, so that the law-making process goes on and is synchronized as much as possible with the perestroyka processes, safeguarding legal preconditions to implement the tasks of perestroyka.

In other words: We have added to what had been very substantial things, which correspond to the requirements of our society that is proceeding along the path of perestroyka. This is the first situation.

The second situation is this: The Constitutional Supervision Committee is added to everything that has been said, that pertains to the first variant, the first situation. Does it make the problem more complicated, or the opposite? All of us, both the speaker here and we in our deliberations, used to proceed from the fact that that was precisely what we needed. We are advancing toward a law-governed state, and this institution should serve the interests of that law-governed state. So what has perturbed certain comrades who are now putting the question point-blank? First, even if we do not make any decision and everything remains as it is, the Constitution is in force, there is a mechanism for ensuring its implementation, and a Constitutional system must be firm. Taking into account the fact that we should follow the processes of perestroyka, we adopted a decision of the known nature at this Congress, and I have recalled the fact. One can live this way, and this does not change...[changes thought] In all circumstances, the Constitution must be enforced, the Union law must be enacted as long as this state lives and functions.

I think, comrades, and I ask all people's deputies to think about the fact that the introduction of such a very important institution as the Committee for Constitutional Supervision will only strengthen law and order in our country and legality in our country, for this is the body which has major specialists in the field of politics and law. It will start creating mechanisms of cooperation with all the republics, those of Union and Republican statuses and others. And by this, an environment will be created which will enable us to work very fruitfully.

Why am I speaking about that? Because an address by a group of Baltic deputies emerged suddenly; they are against this, and this was already voiced during approval procedure. It became known today that the Interregional Group is protesting against this and it will back such feelings. I think, comrades, that we should think thoroughly about that so that the Congress does not become drawn into a political game with unclear goals. I think that we have put such important issues on the agenda for discussion because this is something we need very much.

So my report and all this are to give food for thought and to increase the responsibility of all those who are prepared to take part in discussion, the preparation of documents, and the adoption of a decision.

Moscow TV Relays 21 Dec Congress Proceedings

1302 GMT

LD2112152589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1302 GMT on 21 December begins carrying a recorded relay of the Second Congress of USSR People' Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1302 GMT Gorbachev opens the morning session. He reports that the Presidium has met to determine how much longer the congress will continue. He says five Kirghiz deputies have requested that the session be extended to 2000 hours. Both Saturday and Sunday will

be working days with the view to completing work on Sunday. He puts these proposals to the vote.

At 1308 GMT voting is completed. For 1295; against 584; abstentions 38. The proposals are adopted. From 1100 to 1400 the Congress will debate the draft law on constitutional supervision. Agenda for the following days is outlined, including debate on fight against crime.

At 1311 GMT Deputy Boldyrev takes the floor, wanting to clarify a point on how the debate is going to proceed. Gorbachev corrects him.

At 1312 GMT Deputy Medvedev says that a law on constitutional supervision has not been passed, and therefore it needs to be discussed in greater detail. Believes it should be transferred to a third Congress of People's Deputies. Gorbachev doesn't agree.

AT 1314 GMT Deputy Murashev reminds the deputies of a proposal by Sakharov to debate an item on crime.

At 1317 GMT Kazannik and another deputy takes up the question of the committee for the fight against crime, but Gorbachev brings him to order. Another deputy tries to make a point but Gorbachev thinks they are wasting time. He takes a quick vote from deputies about ending the exchange of opinions and getting on with the agenda.

At 1320 Gorbachev puts the agenda to the vote. For 1385, against 497, abstentions 42.

At 1322 GMT Lukyanov says the session will continue the debate on the status of people's deputies. He passes the floor to Deputy Fargivyev.

At 1323 GMT Deputy Fargiyev proposes a formulation to Articles 2 and 24, which include reference to deputies' immunity from criminal proceedings without the consent of the Supreme Soviet. Moves over to point about deputies' mandates, proposing amendments to Article 19.

At 1327 GMT Deputy Nesterenko is next to speak. He thinks these laws on the status of deputies are very important and calls for them to be adopted. He supports proposals by other deputies, including Nishanov, regarding variants to the laws. He makes a few points on individual articles.

At 1335 GMT Lukyanov wants to bring deputy Plotnieks to the floor but another unnamed deputy wants to have his say.

At 1336 GMT Lukyanov overrules him and calls on Plotnieks to speak. He wants to clarify the question of the law on the status of USSR People's Deputies and status of People's Deputies in the USSR. He believes that perestroyka will only work if it is carried out at all levels. He goes on at length to make various proposals about the status of deputies which should be included in the law.

At 1346 GMT Deputy Kharchenko takes the floor, raising the matter of some cooperatives which some deputies including Sobchak wanted to abolish and proposes to make certain amendments to law on personal incomes.

1349 GMT

LD2112152689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1349 GMT on 21 December continues its recorded relay of proceedings of the Second Congress of People's Deputies. Deputy Kim Yen Un makes a few points about the law on recalling deputies and makes various amendments to articles three and five.

At 1354 GMT Deputy Manko speaks on the question of recalling deputies, also Article 4 on deputies' letters, and on deputies' reporting-back periods and assistants.

At 1358 GMT Deputy Amanbayev says there is no need to make a distinction between the status of USSR People's Deputies and deputies in other USSR bodies. He refers to Article 33 about right of a deputy to be released from work during his duties as a deputy. He believes that a law should be adopted on the recalling of deputies.

At 1403 GMT Deputy Kucher speaks about the image which has formed of the people's deputies among the population, and ways to improve it.

At 1412 GMT Deputy Yorga suggests changes to various sections of the article on deputies' status. She tells of the need to be able to withstand pressure from the local apparatchiks and to protect local rights, in particular in her own republic, Moldavia.

At 1418 GMT Lukyanov tells her that her time is up. She continues in spite of opposition from the hall, but eventually gives up.

At 1419 GMT Deputy Knyazev says that the proposed article does not fully reflect the activities of deputies in current conditions Deputies should not abuse their rights, in partricular to free transport.

At 1427 GMT Deputy Kolesnikov makes specific proposals on the subject of recall of deputies.

At 1430 GMT Lukyanov proposes ending the debate on this question. He puts this to a vote. Vote results—For: 1635; against: 245; abstentions: 16

At 1435 GMT Lukyanov says that Deputy Obolenskiy demands that his draft of the law on deputies' status be put to the vote. He puts this to a vote:

For: 470; against: 1235; abstentions: 211

The Obelenskiy version is rejected.

At 1439 GMT Lukyanov reads out a proposal from a deputy to ban deputies from clapping deputies who

overrun their time. Lukyanov reads out a complaint from a deputy about Yorgas falsification of Moldavian history.

At 1440 GMT a deputy asks a procedural question about Oblenskiy's version.

At 1441 GMT another deputy raises the same matter. Lukyanov says that this can be looked at under any other business later. At 1442 GMT Lukyanov announces a 30-minute break; the television announcer says there will be a 15-minute break in the broadcast of the proceedings.

1500 GMT

LD2112164489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 21 December resumes its recorded relay of proceedings at the Second Congress of People's Deputies.

Gorbachev announces that the draft Law on Constitutional Supervision will be debated. Kerimov then delivers a report on this. All legal documents must be in keeping with the Constitution and the new body charged with ensuring that Constitution is observed will safeguard that, he says. We have never had such a body before. This is the reason why constitional provisions used to be crudely violated in the past. The fundamental law played the role of just an outward facade of democratism during the cult of personality and the period of stagnation. But violations of what is provided for in the Constitution do take place now, too. If the constitution can be violated then you can violate laws as well and this will lead to chaos and anarchy. No one has the right to change constitutional norms, add to them or repeal them, apart from the supreme legislative body. Only the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR has the right to bring the provisions of the Constitution more up to date if they are deemed to be obsolete, Kerimov states.

At 1509 GMT Kerimov notes that the Constitutional Commission, set up by the First Congress of People's Deputies, has commenced its work. Draft new Constitution will be presented to the next Congress. The First Congress initiated this work. Why adopt a Law on Constitutional Supervision before the new Constitution is adopted? He says it is necessary because legislative work is already underway. There is a need to ensure that Constitutional provisions are adhered to. Constitutional provisions which run counter to perestroyka can be repealed by the Committee for Constitutional Supervision. Laws on ownership, land, tax system, the enterprise, self management and many others are to be introduced in 1990. Can this be done if some of their provisions run counter to the constitution? A mechanism must be set up to ensure that laws are in keeping with the Constitution and that the latter can be amended before the new one is adopted.

At 1515 GMT Kerimov says that no socialist law-governed state can exist without a body of this kind—a Committee for Constitutional Supervision, something that is already provided for in Article 125 of the present Constitution. Much work has already been done to facilitate this. This article must also be amended and congress will have to examine a draft of this in the course of its work. None of this infringes the sovereign rights of union republics. In the fullness of time the new body may come to be known as the Constitutional Council, he says.

At 1520 GMT he says republican legal acts can now be controlled from the center. There have been proposed amendments with which the commission cannot agree. He quotes from Articles 73 and 74 from the USSR Constitution. Further proposals on initiative of the committee for constitutional supervision. But the new draft of Article 125 exercises less control over republican laws—it merely provides for ensuring that republican laws are in keeping with the Constitution.

AT 1530 GMT Kerimov says union and autonomous republics can have their own constitutional supervision bodies which will be completely independent. Members of the USSR Committee of Constitutional Supervision are elected by the Supreme Soviet. In capitalist countries members of similar bodies are not elected but appointed. He cites examples from Austria, Italy, France. The committee will have eleven members, and will continue for 5 years. Then new members will again be elected, this time for 10 years. Out of 23 members of the committee overall, 15 will be from republics; the remainder will be experts in various fields of policy and legal matters. There will be safeguards to make sure that republican or professional balance is not disturbed as far as the committee's membership is concerned, he says.

1540 GMT

LD2112165189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1540 GMT on 21 December continues its recorded relay of the Second Congress of People's Deputies. Kerimov continues his report, stating that supervision by procuracy bodies, already in force according to the law, will not infringe the remit of the new committee. But it will be wide enough to encompass legislative initiatives, decisions by public organizations and so forth. The draft law also has a special article which deals with examination of controversial matters and disputes between Union republics, national-state and national-territorial formations. The committee, dealing with such disputes, could only deal with the legal and certainly not the political aspects of such disputes. In other words, the committee, as an independent and democratically elected body, would perform the role of arbitration in disputes referred to above.

At 1547 GMT Kerimov says the draft law also outlines in detail procedures for bringing disputes to be resolved by the committee.

At 1549 GMT he notes that the 10 November 1989 Supreme Soviet session examined both the new draft law and draft Article 125 in detail and decided to submit them for congress' approval. The new committee, when set up, will facilitate perestroyka. Kerimov finishes his report.

At 1550 GMT Gorbachev asks whether people wish to ask questions orally or in writing? In writing, Thanks. Now he moves on to examining the draft, and makes a "small co-report."

At 1558 GMT Deputy Gryazin says that legal rights of republics would be further infringed if the new law is adopted. He quotes numerous legal documents to support his view. In the olden days, if republican laws departed from the Constitution, the Supreme Soviet could merely recommend that they be brought into line, in keeping with the Constitution. The proposed committee would have wider powers. Inconsistency or contradiction can be pointed out, he says, but this is where the matter ought to end. In order to preserve the Union, divergences must be allowed.

At 1607 GMT Deputy Dolov supports the law on constitutional supervision and calls on deputies to vote for it. It needs to be adopted as soon as possible. Republics have no need to fear the Committee for Constitutional Supervision as the congress will have the final word.

At 1612 GMT Deputy Sobchak says that deputies should be looking toward the new Constitution in their current considerations. Some deputies think that the proposed committee will infringe the rights of Union republics, but at present national minorities' rights are infringed in many Union republics and the committee will be able to protect these minorities. The personal composition of the committee will be very important and should be given careful consideration. The committee should be given greater powers to stop illegal acts by other bodies. [applause]

At 1621 GMT Deputy Gulova points out that many laws which have been adopted are not being implemented and this causes mistrust among the population. The proposed committee will ensure observation of laws.

At 1623 GMT Deputy Ostroukhov says that actions should be taken to strengthen the federation.

1630 GMT

LD2112193889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1630 GMT on 21 December continues its recorded relay of the Second Congress of People's Deputies. At 1630 GMT, Deputy Khadirke, a Moldavian writer, speaks in favor of a constitutional court to help avoid illegal acts. There should be a new constitution, a new treaty among the republics, a constitutional court. Haste should be avoided on this legislation.

At 1637 GMT Lukyanov makes various announcements on times and venues for fringe meetings.

At 1639 GMT Gorbachev announces a break.

AT 1642 GMT Lukyanov tells of the drafting commission's work on the law on deputies' status. Commission Chairman Pivovarov reports on its work. Pivovarov tells of deputies' proposals. He tells of some of the changes to be made to the draft. He mentions some proposals that have not been incorporated and explains why they have been found unacceptable.

At 1708 GMT Lukyanov asks about the fate of a specific proposal which was not included.

At 1710 GMT Pivovarov asks the working group to reply.

At 1711 GMT Deputy Kugultinov asks about his proposal on the recall of deputies representing public organizations. Pivovarov replies. Kugultinov makes further comments. Lukyanov says this is not a debate.

At 1713 GMT a deputy asks about deputies' immunities. Pivovarov explains how the proposed version was arrived at. Various deputies' from the hall then ask abut points. Pivovarov and the working group reply, mainly as to why certain proposals were not accepted.

At 1726 GMT Lukyanov proposes ending the questions and puts it to the vote: for: 1640; against: 251; abstentions: 21.

At 1729 GMT the recorded relay resumes. Lukyanov puts to the vote amendments to the law on deputies" status. Lukyanov announces the passing of the amendment.

At 1733 GMT Lukyanov says he will put to the vote a proposal by Deputy Kharchenko.

At 1736 GMT Deputy Rubiks from the hall then suggests that there should be voting on each article of the law. He raises various other points. Lukyanov asks to have them in writing. He then refers deputies to the wording in question. Rubiks makes a specific proposal for a change of wording concerning application of the status law to other bodies.

At 1742 GMT Lukyanov puts Rubiks' proposal to the vote: for: 618; against: 1189; abstained: 99.

At 1747 GMT a deputy asks about voters' instructions to deputies. The working group and Pivovarov rely.

At 1749 GMT Lukyanov puts to the vote the law with the amendments proposed by the commission.

At 1750 GMT a deputy suggests that the voting should be by name. Lukyanov accepts the proposal: for: 1697; against 170; abstained: 60

Lukyanov then says that on the law on recalling deputies there are two proposals: to vote on it or to send it to the Supreme Soviet for further elaboration.

At 1754 GMT Deputy Boldyrev says that the debate has been too short; Lukyanov disagrees. He puts to the vote whether the law on recall should be adopted at the current congress: for: 772; against: 1090; abstained: 70.

Lukyanov puts to the vote whether the draft will be sent to the Supreme Soviet for elaboration: for: 1613; against: 2282; abstained: 31.

Lukyanov puts to the vote the wording of the instruction to be given to the Supreme Soviet. First, to elaborate and adopt the new law: for: 1313; against: 578; abstained: 51. Thus, there is no need to vote on the other versions.

At 1808 GMT Lukyanov announces a 30-minute brak.

1810 GMT

LD2112201789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1810 GMT on 21 December continues its recorded relay of the Second Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Lukyanov says that there will be further discussion of the law on constitutional supervision.

At 1811 GMT Deputy Akayev says that union republics should not have the right of veto over union laws. The supervising committee will have an important role to play. He calls on deputies to support the law.

At 1816 GMT Deputy Kryuchkov tells of discussions with Baltic representatives on this law. Some disagree with this law for purely political ends. This law will produce great improvements in public life. Similar laws exist in other federative states.

At 1827 GMT Deputy Shapkhayev quotes Sopchak as having said that the constitutional supervision committee will promote constitutional reform and a separation of powers.

At 1832 GMT Deputy Yakolev, an academic, says one of the key aspects of the constitional supervision committee is in the area of sovereignty of the republics. The committee must keep a close eye on executive authority. The problem of reform is that we are sailing on the very ship that we are trying to restructure; we can't get off it and onto another. He doesn't want the committee to have jurisdiction over the courts and suggests this provision be removed.

At 1840 GMT Deputy (?Markhadzhayev) says the point of the October Revolution was to deliver people from exploitation. Were the gains of the revolution adequately protected by the USSR's four previous constitutions? Regrettably there was no system for overseeing them. The committee will be part of the checks and balances that the Soviet system requires today. He suggests changes in the wording to improve some clauses of the document.

At 1849 GMT Admiral Ivanov of the Baltic Fleet says the military is in the frontline of ideological confrontation and also exposed to the forces of extremism and nationalism. Anti-army forces have managed to instill oppostiion to army service in the Baltic region and the Transcaucasus, encouraging desertion and hostility to the army. Such actions can only undermine the country's defense capability. Officers will find it easier to serve in a professional army, but the state will be worse off if conscription is dropped. Recent Estonian decisions discriminate against servicemen in housing allocation. Specific proposals are penalities for desertion, draft by decision of the Supreme Soviet not the Ministry of Defence, etc.

At 1901 GMT Deputy Sultangazin says the constitutional supervision committee wil have a useful role to play in regulating the relations between the center and the republics. He makes specific proposals for changes to the document.

At 1909 GMT Lukyanov reads out a statement from LITERATURNAYA GAETAS Voronov, who apologizes for an article which may have offended ex-spacewoman Tereshkova.

At 1910 GMT Deputy Vorobyev suggests that a publication be instituted to give deputies a platform between congresses. He is also concerned about the disappearance of small ethnic minorities.

At 1916 GMT Yuriy Afanasyev, from the interregional group, approaches the rostrum with a statement signed by 140 members of the group and Baltic deputies. Reform is lagging behind the rate of collapse of the old economic system, he reads. The group is obliged to note its difference with the majority at the congress in opposing the party's monopolistic, interfering role in Soviet life. In refusing to discuss Article 6, the congress has thereby come to the defense of the party's monopoly of power and disregarded the wishes of millions. Peasants must immediately be allowed to choose whether to leave collective farms. We are against the perpetuation of the imperialist empire created by Stalin, and self-determination must be given to the Soviet Union's peoples. Gorbachev's speech the day before yesterday on ownership and land was seen by the group as constructive, but specific dates—January and February—must be set for the Supreme Soviet and congress sessions to discuss these laws.

At 1925 GMT female Deputy Matviyenko criticizes the unequal position of women in society and notes the dearth of women in high office.

At 1932 GMT Deputy Svyatoslav Medvedev replies to the Afanasyev statement. He claims the statement is unconstructive and that Afanasyev is wrong to equate Article 6 with the party's monopoly of power. The

congress has merely postponed discussion of Article 6, not ruled out such discussion. Medvedev asks what the social cost of the interregional group's "radicialism" is going to be. Before making a decision on land ownership, let us first ask the peasants what they think. The danger is that we shall get a "dispossession of the kulaks in reverse". The group's desire for a struggle for power must be condemned.

1941 GMT

LD2112215889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1941 GMT on 21 December continues its recorded relay of the Second Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1942 GMT Deputy Yelagin expresses worry about irresponsibility in foreign economic relations, due to the wasteful use of hard currency resources. He is also concerned that the local soviets have too little power on such matters as amenities. He says: We need to change the economy, but we shouldn't precipitate the collapse of the Soviet Union by doing such things as renaming streets previously named after Lenin, as happened in Vilnius.

At 1949 GMT Deputy (?Lunyayev) a trade union representative, says: We don't want a policy of "the worse, the better". The interregional group regards as inertia everything that does not fit in with its preconceived notions. The group's members suffer from political Dantonism. The party started restructuring, and the party is continuing restructuring. There is no room for risky experiments.

At 1956 GMT Deputy Lopatin, in uniform, wants details of where the military budget goes, and asks about dachas being built for top military officers. The Armed Forces are lagging behind the situation in the world and restructuring in the Soviet Union. Officers in the Army and Navy believe they are facing a crisis. The causes are to be found in the lack of accountability of the narrow circle of senior officials who run military affairs. He calls for a referendum on Article 6, to be held simultaneously with the forthcoming regional elections.

At 2004 GMT Yevgeniy Yevtushenko criticizes attempts to cause the intelligentsia and the Soviet leadership fall-out, referring to an earlier speech by General Surkov, in which he criticzed writers. The premature death of Sakharov is a bitter lesson about the behavior of people who only gave him a minute's silence after he was gone. Writers are rightly calling for quite proper improvements in the Army. Is it right then that generals spend so much effort criticzing writers for this? Let us seek consensus, and not fall out, my dear general, a consensus based on a belief in peace, happiness, and prosperity, not on the domination of the majority by a minority.

At 2013 GMT Gorbachev rounds up worldwide protests of the U.S. invasion of Panama. The Soviet Government today issued a protest, he says. Moldavian deputies are asking for a reaction to the Romanian events, but we need information. The Soviet ambassador in Bucharest has been asked to seek information, and the Romanian envoy in Moscow has been asked for an elucidation. The Western press is putting out dramatic reports, but these were not confirmed by the Soviet ambassador.

At 2016 GMT Gorbachev goes on to read a message about the withdrawal of the Lithuanian Communist Party from the CPSU.

At 2018 GMT, Lukyanov reads various announcements. The recorded relay then concludes.

21 Dec Speeches at Congress of People's Deputies

Yuriy Kolmykov Remarks

LD2112152389 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Yuriy Kolmykov, vice-chairman of the parliamentary Legal and Law Enforcement Committee, stressed the importance of setting up a USSR Constitutional Compliance Committee. He told TASS in connection with today's discussion of a corresponding bill at the Congress of People's deputies that all advanced nations had special courts, committees or commissons supervising the observance of constitutional rights. The Soviet Union has never had such a body.

Speaking about the fears of certain deputies lest the new body encroach upon the sovereign rights of their republics, Yuriy Kolmykov said that such fears were groundless. He said that the committee was called upon to guarantee democratic reforms in the country including those pertaining to problems of federalism. It will see that the Republics keep in step with the Federation and that their rights are not jeopardised by the centre.

"Many apprehensions of the Union Republics will disappear when problems of Soviet federalism are decided," Kolmykov said. "After the powers of the Republics and the centre are delineated, many questions will be withdrawn from the latter's jurisdiction and solved by the Union Republics themselves," he pointed out.

Yuriy Afanasayev

LD2112233889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1916 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Address by Yuriy Afanasyev, Interregional group of Deputies member, at the 21 December session of the Second Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies, I am empowered to read out to the congress a statement that, so far, has been

signed by 140 people's deputies from the Interregional Group. I say so far, because it has not been signed by everyone who has expressed a desire to do so and who will sign it later. In addition, the Baltic group of people's deputies also subscribe to this statement. Therefore, in this statement, I express the position of at least 250 delegates, USSR people's deputies.

A statement by the Interregional Group of USSR People's Deputies:

Given the extraordinary nature of the current situation in the country, whereby the transformations being implemented are lagging behind the pace of disintegration of the existing socioeconomic system, it will only be possible for the country to escape the deepening crisis by immediate, consistent, and cardinal reforms. Being aware of our responsibility to the voters and the people of the country for the present and the future, we, USSR people's deputies, having united to form the Interregional Group of Deputies at the first congress by virtue of the closeness of our political views and of the basic provisions of our electoral platforms, are obliged to state that there are fundamental differences between our group's positions on a number of basic issues and those of the majority at the second congress.

We are against the decreed leading role of the CPSU, that is, the party's monopoly of power, power that has brought the country unheard-of misfortune. We are against the direct and straight intervention of the party apparatus, the Politburo, and the CPSU Central Committee in state, economic, and other spheres in the life of society that should lie exclusively within the competence of the local soviets and be regulated by the law alone.

Having refused to include in the agenda the question on Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, the congress has not merely shown scorn for the opinion of the country's millions of citizens, but also has risen in defense of a constitutional enshrinement of the CPSU's leadership monopoly over all spheres of society's life, including, what is especially unacceptable on the threshold of the elections, over the media.

We are in favor of the people's freedom being united in political organizations and the equality of these organizations before the law. We are against the state-governed economy, and we do not consider it possible to stop the collapse of the national economy exclusively by means of administrative prohibitions and orders. The attempt to postpone for several more years the transition to genuine market economy and the independence of the enterprises is extremely dangerous. It is for this reason that we have come out against the approval of the program offered to the congress by the government; because for all its outward novelty, we expect, as a result of its fulfillment an aggravation of the crisis and a worsening of the conditions for the realizaiton of further economic and political reforms.

Further, our starting point is the idea that the Council of Ministers must be independent and bear full responsibility for its actions without shifting it onto the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the Congress, or the Supreme Soviet. We consider it necessary that the peasants should be allowed immediately to choose for themselves any forms of management, including their free departure from state and collective farms, with their share of land and property.

Having postponed consideration of the fundamental question of rejecting the state monopoly of land, mineral wealth, and so on, as well as means of production, secured by the Constitution, the congress has in fact sanctioned an obstacle-free way for solving our economic problems in the framework of the present property relations without radically changing them.

We are against the submission of the national republics to a strong center, that is against the unitary, imperial state created by Stalin and preserved to the present. We consider it necessary to work out as soon as possible a new treaty on the Soviet Union as a free and voluntary unification of sovereign republics, according to the formula: strong republics and the center created by them. At the foundation of the Soviet Union there must be the right of any people to self-determination, right up to its separation.

Having ignored the burning question of the national and state structure of the USSR—a key issue in the matter of solving the interethnic conflicts—the congress has included in the agenda the question of creating the committee for constitutional supervision whose task it is to protect the provisions of the present Constitution, obstructing the radical reorganization of society. Thus in these questions of vital importance our group has in fact found itself in opposition to the majority of the congress delegates.

Our common aim is to ensure effective parliamentary activity, indispensible conditions of which are the full-blooded functioning of parliamentary groups, the granting of the right to set forth and defend one's positions on all the matters at issue and to communicate them to the country's citizens through one's own press organs.

At the same time, the Interregional Group of Deputies is ready for constructive dialogue with other parliamentary groups: agrarians, scientists, ecologists, youth, culture and education, the Baltic group, the Ukrainian republican deputies' club, and others.

It is responsibility for the destiny of our country that determines our stance.

That's the text of the statement. To conclude, I would like to say that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech the day before yesterday on the decision by which...for ensuring that the decisions on land, ownership, and enterprises are adopted more quickly, was in our view a constructive reaction to the proposals drawn up both in

the Interregional Group and by other deputies. We regard that statement as something highly positive and, at the same time, clearly in the interests of the cause. Because time is now measured not in months, not even in weeks, precise dates should be determined for holding a Supreme Soviet session to examine these laws and of the congress. To be specific, the Supreme Soviet should sit in January and the congress in February of next year to examine these laws.
Thank you.

Vladimir Lopatin

LD2212092689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1956 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Address by Vladimir Lopatin, from Vologda Oblast, at the 21 December session of the Second Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] Respected congress, respected chairman! My words, which I and my colleagues have been trying to speak daily, are directed toward you and will be about our common and personal responsibility which is becoming, unfortunately often, the object of speculation. I agree to bearing responsibility for all the decisions adopted by the congress irrespective of my own position during voting. I am also prepared to share responsibility with the government. But you will also agree that we are right to expect, on the threshold of such decisions, the fulfillment of at least four conditions. The first is to know the truth ourselves. On what military programes and needs are R70 billion, which comprise one-third of all military expenditure, spent? We know about all of the U.S. military programs after their ratification in congress and know nothing about our own. Is this in order? Why, with the social orientation and the priority of common human values and rights in the whole life of society, are these processes lagging significantly behind in the military sphere? Is it not, among other things, because while tens of thousands of officers and ensigns' families are without homes, dachas for individual military leaders are being built here in the suburbs of Moscow to a total value of more than 500,000 each—this was written about recently by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and unfortunately no answer or refutation or confirmation of it has been received. This list of blank spots, which cannot be hidden as any kind of military or state secret, can be enumerated further.

This is why I ask that an official explanation be given for this and other issues which have come up during the course of the congress and I would like to believe that they will be gained to those inquiries which were made during the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Second, we must be confident that this truth is known by the leadership and the government. How are things in reality? Judge for yourselves: after my conversation with Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, on his instructions—for which I am grateful to him—a commission was dispatched to Vologda Oblast, where it worked under the leadership of Comrade Averyanov, deputy chairman of the state agro-industrial committee of the nonchernozem zone of the RSFSR. It studied the food issue and sought an answer as to why an oblast that used to export oil and flax has turned into one that imports oil and cultivates flax using French technology. And the commission found an answer, though without visiting a single collective or state farm in the oblast. It found it within the walls of the oblast executive committee and the oblast agro-industrial committee.

There is a good French saying for this: the servants make the king. And it seems to me that the (?election) of a government that obtained a vote of confidence was not underpinned with the appropriate qualitative purge of the make-up and apparatus of those executive bodies, which in the end takes its toll on the authority of the unquestionably respected leaders of those bodies.

A similar situation has developed in the defense sphere. The present state of the Armed Forces is in profound contradiction with the changes in the world. They are lagging behind the perestroyka processes in the country, and they do not match up to their original nature, to the predestination of a socialist army—being in effect a cheap labor force—or to the lofty importance of the Army for the defense of the fatherland, alongside the wretched situation in which the majority of army and navy personnel find themselves today.

The measures being taken by the military are, regrettably, frequently cosmetic in nature and are not producing the expected benefits.

You are probably asking where I get all this from. We maintain—we, that is, representatives of the Army and Navy officer corps—that we are faced with a crisis, the solution to which is a profound military reform. But what reform can there be when the speeches at the congress, the session and in the mass media are dominated by spirited jingoistic sentiments. And the reason for this? The Leninist tradition, whereby issues of military construction were each year at the center of attention of the people, the central state bodies and the party, has been forgotten. In the postwar period this attention has been reduced to speeches by one or two military leaders at these levels and to greetings from military delegations at party congresses. As a result, defense and army issues ended up at the center of attention of only a narrow circle of individuals in the Defense Council, created by nobody knows who, and of the military department itself. The command was virtually uncontrolled, and in the absence of a sufficient legal basis it degenerated into thriving arbitrary rule, permissiveness, and protectionism.

Tell me, can you expect this departmental truth from the leaders of those departments? Probably not. But can one expect it from below? They don't let us speak. Are you happy with this sort of army? We are not. And, incidentally this year alone spokesmen for the military department have more than once stated that the army must remain as it is. [passage omitted]

TASS Reports 21 Dec Congressional Proceedings

Constitutional Compliance Bill

LD2112151589 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—Following a report by Jhangir Kerimov, chairman of the commission assigned to draft bills on constitutional compliance, an Estonian lawyer addressed the 2nd Congress of People's Deputies. He expressed the special opinion of four members of the commission who disagree with the proposed documents.

The deputy, Igor Gryazin, said that the four disagree in principle with the proposed wording of Article 125 of the Soviet Constitution. The Article envisages that if republican legal acts contradict the country's constitution, the body that introduced them should eliminate the contradictions.

If this is not done, All-Union bodies will decide on their annulment upon notification from the committee for constitutional compliance.

Explaining the viewpoint of the deputies who signed the special opinion, Gryazin said that, politically, the projected changes "not only fail to serve the restoration of the sovereign rights of the Union Republics, but restrict even their existing rights."

The deputy said that the premise that Republican Supreme Soviets are subordinate to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the congress of People's Deputies is false.

Gryazin did not agree with Article 11 of the bill, which envisages the examination of Union-Republican disputes by the Committee for Constitutional Compliance, an All-Union body.

Debate on Bill

LD2112152189 Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—The majority of deputies who took the floor at the Second Congress of People's Deputies today favoured the adoption of a law on constitutional compliance with ensuing amendments to the Soviet Constitution.

Aleksandr Udalov, a railwayman from Kostroma region, in the north of Russia, described the law as "timely."

Delay with its adoption "will complicate the situation in the country," he warned. Udalov rejected the opinion of deputies who believe the committee "will start carving up indiscriminately the Constitutions of the Union Republics."

Anatoliy Sobchak, a Leningrad lawyer whom journalists have got used to seeing on the rostrum in the role of opponent, unequivocally supported the proposed bills.

He told Congress about "glaring violations of the rights of national minorities in several republics."

He favoured granting more power to the Committee for Constitutional Compliance to suspend unlawful, unconstitutional acts both of Union Republics and various All-Union bodies.

Viktor Ostroukhov, a party official from Tomsk, stressed the important role of constitutional compliance in strengthening the federative principles in the country's state structure.

He emphasised the significance of retaining in Soviet legislation the provision on the supremacy of All-Union legislation over Republican laws.

Ion Khadyrke, a Moldavian writer, expressed a view that differed from the opinion of the previous speakers. On the whole, he was in favour of constitutional compliance, provided, however, that the oversight body is established after the adoption of a new Soviet Constitution.

The debate will be continued on Friday. At its afternoon sitting today, Congress resumed discussion of a package of bills on the status of people's deputies.

Constitutional Compliance Emphasized

LD2112151189 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Bills on constitutional compliance and on corresponding amendments to the Soviet Constitution were submitted today to the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR by Jangir Kerimov, chairman of the Drafting Comission.

Speaking of the need for a constitutional compliance committee, which is being formed for the first time in this country, Kerimov noted that many all-union and republican constitutional provisions were violated by orders and injunctions issued by various ministries and departments.

Constitutional compliance is particularly important in the perestroyka period when numerous fundamental laws are being adopted.

The committee will verify compliance with the constitution of different legal acts passed by state bodies and public organisations, including the party, and will also check the already adopted documents, including international agreements concluded by the USSR and the Union Republics.

The Committee will have the right to suspend acts that contradict the Constitution or Soviet legislation, except laws passed by the Congress of People's Deputies and Constitutions of Union Republics. The committee's verdict can be repealed only by the Congress of People's Deputies by a two-thirds vote.

According to the bill, the committee will also settle disputes between the Union and the Republics, and between the Union Republics and their constituent national territorial formations on the constitutionality of their laws.

The speaker moved to relegate the settlement of disputes between Union Republics and the national formations to the jurisdication of their corresponding constitutional compliance committees.

Jangir Kerimov stressed that the principles of constitutional compliance proposed for the country as a whole did not encroach upon the sovereignty of Union Republics. The Committee will deal only with the constitutions and laws of the Union Republics and not with enactments of their governments.

Kerimov noted that some people's deputies, including two members of the commission he heads, believe that the All-Union Committee should not deal with any legal acts of the Union Republics. However, the Commission believes that such an approach contradicts the federative principle of the state's structure.

Speaking about the structure and formation of the proposed USSR Constitutional Compliance Committee, Kerimov noted that it should consist of a president, his deputy, and 21 committee members, including one representative from each Union Republic. The committee members' term of office will be ten years.

They will be absolutely independent and subordinated only to the Constitution of the USSR. The committee will be renewed by half every five years. This is why eleven members of its first composition will discharge their duties for only a half of the complete term envisaged under the law.

Soviet president took the floor at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies today after a report on bills on constitutional compliance had been delivered.

He said that a group of Baltic deputies opposed the proposed drafts, as did the Interregional Deputies Group.

Gorbachev invited deputies to think over two situations. In the first case, if the Constitutional Compliance committee is not established, everything will remain as it is now.

"It means Article 74 of the USSR Constitution, under which the USSR law has equal force on the territory of all Union Republics, remains in force. If a Republican law runs counter to that of the Union, the latter takes precedence."

The Soviet president explained that another article is also in force, under which the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet "exercises control over constitutional compliance and ensures compliance of the constitutions and laws of union republics with the USSR Constitution and laws."

Gorbachev said that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet had invoked that right, including in recent situations when decisions had to be made.

In the second case, all this is complemetned by the Constitutional compliance commttee.

"We all assumed that this was what we needed," he stressed. "As we are moving towards a law-governed state, this institution should serve the interests of this law-governed state."

Gorbachev stressed that the Constitutional Compliance Committee would help strengthen law and order in the country.

Kirimov Submits Drafts

LD2112121189 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS —By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, which is continuing for the ninth day here, today began to discuss bills on constitutional compliance and on corresponding amendments to the Soviet Constitution. They were submitted by Dzhangir Kirimov, chairman of the drafting commission.

The need to set up a constitutional compliance committee, which is being formed for the first time in the Soviet Union, was stipulated in the 1988 amendments to the country's basic law, spelling out the structure of supreme bodies of power and procedures for their election.

However, a group of delegates, mostly from Lithuania, walked out last summer when the First Congress of People's Deputies began to discuss the question of electing the committee.

They wished to demonstrate their opposition to such a body since, in their opinion, it would infringe upon their sovereignty. Respecting the minority view, it was decided to put off the discussion until the Second Congress and to set up a special commission to draw up corresponding bills.

But several delegates, from the Baltic republics again, opposed the inclusion of the constitutional compliance bill in the agenda of the current congress too. On the other hand, representatives of the non-indigenous population of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania insist that such a committee be instituted because, in their opinion, laws recently passed in those republics contradict not only the existing constitution, but also international human rights conventions.

After a roll-call vote the bill was included in the agenda along with the question of electing a constitutional compliance committee.

News Conference on Compliance Bill

LD2112160889 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The process of building a rule-of-law state is unthinkable without a special body to monitor compliance with the constitution, the fundamental law of the USSR—this view was shared by all three participants in a Kremlin news conference devoted to the congressional debate on constitutional compliance.

The following Soviet officials addressed the news conference:

—Andris Plotnieks, people's deputy, lawyer,
—Mikhail Piskotin, chief editor of the NARODNY DEPUTAT JOURNAL,
—Georgiy Kryuchkov, people's deputy, head of the Odessa regional party organisation, the Ukraine.

At the same time, the three expressed different views on many aspects of the issue under consideration. Plotnieks said that the new body should be established only after the adoption of a new constitution since the existing constitution is, in many respects, becoming a brake on perestroika.

Stressing the importance of a committee for constitutional compliance, Piskotin said that if such a body had existed, it might have been possible to curb the wave of Stalinist repressions in the 1930s.

The establishment of the committee would help exclude encroachments on democracy in the future, he remarked.

In response to fears expressed by some deputies that the Committee for Constitutional Compliance may become a "lever of pressure" on Union Republics, Kkryuchkov said that the mechanism of control over the correspondence of republican acts to the soviet Constitution already exists today. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has exercised this right.

At the same time, the establishment of the committee would make it possible to observe both the interests of republics and the federation as a whole, he said.

In Kryuchkov's opinion, the Committee for Constitutional Compliance can tell any organisation, including the Communist Party, that its decision contradicts the Soviet Constitution.

"We have repeatedly declared that the party works within the constitutional framework, and this provision applies to party organisations of all levels, up to the highest ones," Kryuchkov pointed out.

"I think that this approach will also strengthen the party's authority," he added.

Law on Deputies' Status Passes

LD2112204889 Moscow Tass in English 2009 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

After a two-day debate on three bills to regulate the activity of Soviet people's deputies in the country, only one of the bills was voted into law.

The congress in Moscow passed today the Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the Soviet Union, a single legal act to regulate their activity, rights and duties, by a majority of 1,697, with 170 against and 60 abstaining.

It was noted at the congress that the new law opened up new prospects for genuine democratic principles to rule the country.

The law lays down uniform principles upon which the system of Soviets is based throughout the country. It determines in general terms the rights and duties of deputies, permitting republican legislation to further specify them.

The law concerning people's deputies of all levels was passed relatively fast, while the bill on the status of deputies of the USSR evoked—both during the earlier phase in the USSR Supreme Soviet, its committees and commissions and at the congress itself—lengthy debates that yielded no final decision. A majority vote returned the bill to the USSR Suprme Soviet for further elaboration and approval.

The congress also considered a bill on the procedure for recalling Soviet people's deputies. Opinions on individual provisions of the document differed so dramtically that no compromise solution was reached. Some deputies insisted that a deputy should be recalled if 25 per cent of the voters so demanded. Others countered the proposal by pointing out its glaring variance with the law on elections, under which a deputy is considered elected if more than half of the voters cast ballots in his favour.

Eventually, the congress decided to hand the bill over to the USSR Supreme Soviet for elaboration and to reconsider it at the Third Congress of People's Deputies. The bill will be published before the Third Congress to enable voters to have their say on the matter.

'Status' Package Explained

LD2112175889 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

A package of bills on deputy status and activity came up for a vote this afternoon after a two-day debate at the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies.

Speakers in the debate made numerous proposals concerning guarantees of deputy immunity, financial resources and other practical matters.

Differences of principle arose when discussing whether the congress should determine the status of deputies at all levels or only at the federal one.

Representing one point of view, Professor Andris Plotnieks (Latvia) said the bill on the status of people's deputies in the Soviet Union was intended to define the legal status of other deputies. He proposed that the congresss adopt a law on the status of deputies to the federal legislature, while leaving the rest to union republics. This proposal evoked numerous protests. Dzhumgalbek Amanbayev, party chief from Issyk-Kul region (Kirghiz Republic), said that those who oppose the adoption of the law on the status of the people's deputy in the USSR are driving a wedge between federal legislators and deputies to republican and local Soviets. He insisted that one single act should reflect the status of all people's deputies. The bill under discussion was an act suited to the purpose.

Other speakers proposed the inclusion of an article on interpellation. Journalist Valeriy Kucher of the city of Magnitogorsk in the southern Urals said that a deputy should have the right to question the government or its members about a specific issue or the government's policy as a whole. After a response is received, the deputy may demand a vote on the matter, including the no-confidence vote. On the whole, the package of bills was approved by the majority of speakers in the debate.

Financial Declaration Proposed

LD2112120589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] As always on days when the Congress of People's Deputies is in session, we start with a direct line to the correspondents' post in the Kremlin. Correspondent Vladimir Koroblyev is on the line today. We're listening:

[Koroblyev] Today is the 9th day of work for the Second Congress of People's Deputies which under the agenda previously adopted was to end its work tomorrow. However, the Congress is to be extended for a few more days. This was reported to the deputies today by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev who opened the morning session. He noted that with the time-limit previously adopted, the Congress is a day and a half behind schedule and, on behalf of the Presidium, he suggested to the deputies that on the days that remain they work until 2000, declare Saturday and Sunday working days, and end the work of the Second Congress of People's Deputies in the afternoon of Sunday, 24 December. This decision was adopted by a majority of People's Deputies.

Discussion continued today of the draft laws on the status of People's Deputies within the USSR. Deputies Fargaiyev, Nesterenko, Plotnikov, Kharchenko, Kim, Manko, Amanbayev, Kucher, Iorga, Knyazev, and Kolesnikov took part in the debates on the draft legislative acts defining the status of the People's Deputies and on other issues linked to the activity of the deputies. They proposed the introduction of a number of addenda and amendments to articles of the draft law, which would strengthen the foundations of the status of all USSR People's Deputies, their most important powers and the guarantee of their activity as deputies, their accountability to the voters and the creation of the necessary conditions for efficient work by the deputies. Naturally, all USSR People's Deputies are concerned about these legislative acts since their adoption would reinforce their activity in their constituencies and here I should like to talk about the proposals deputies introduced during the discussion of the law on the status of USSR People's Deputies.

Deputy Kharchenko, for example, proposed the introduction of an article that would stipulate a declaration on the part of the deputies regarding their material situation and their financial savings in roubles in order that this information could be published for the deputies in a special bulletin. Deputy Knyazev noted that the law should reflect the provision that prior to traveling to a Congress of People's Deputies or Supreme Soviet session, every deputy must meet the voters and agree on a plan of action with them. Deputy Kim noted that since the law has not yet been fully worked out, it evidently makes no sense as yet to raise the issue of recalling deputies. There were a good many other proposals. It was decided to halt the debates on the matter under discussion and a break has now been announced at the Congress. After the break, the deputies are to begin discussion of the issue of constitutional supervision in the USSR and at 1600 they will come back to the draft law on the status of People's Deputies within the USSR, on which an appropriate resolution of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies will be adopted. There I end my report from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Resolution on Economic Report

LD2112213389 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The congress believes that the way out of a complex situation in the economy is radical restructuring, deepening and speeding up of the economic reform.

This is said in a reoslution of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the government's report about economic recovery, stage-by-stage implementation of an economic reform and fundamental approaches to the drafting of the 13th Five-Year Plan.

The congress supported the measures proposed by the government and instructed it to take into consideration to the utmost the proposals and remarks made by the people's deputies.

The congress instructed the government to implement measures for financial recovery, stabilisation of money circulation and filling consumer market with goods in 1990-1992.

The Government was instructed to work out in 1990 a programme for making the rouble convertible, to implement from 1991 a stage-by- stage transfer of economic relations with socialist countries to the conditons of world prices and setting of accounts in freely convertible currency.

The congress deems it expedient to speed up the implementation of a radical economic reform, of economic transformations in the process of forming a socialist market.

The USSR Supreme Soviet was instructed to discuss in the first six months of 1990 the draft laws on property, land, local government, the single system of taxation, on the socialist enterprise, and general principles of economic management and management of the social area in union and autonomous republics.

The Government was instructed to work out and submit to the Supreme Soviet in 1990 draft laws on the State Bank of the USSR, on the banking system, investment activity, and employment, and to complete in the first six months of 1990 the preparatory work for the revision of wholesale and purchase prices.

In the work on the plan for 1991-1995, the government should ensure its linkage with measures for the deepening of the economic reform on the basis of new economic laws, and radically change the contents and mechanism of centralised planning.

Measures have been envisaged for priority development of the agro-industrial complex, for the perfection of the investment policy, environmental protection and development of the social sector of the economy.

The government was instructed to submit to the Supreme Soviet the draft five-year plan for 1991-1995 not later than September 1, 1990 and to refer to the Supreme Soviet every year a report analysing the socio-economic situation in the country.

The congress made a call to the working people to combine their efforts to fulfil the tasks to overcome society's crisis.

Urgent Issues Not on Agenda

LD2112223389 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

In remarks winding up the afternoon session of the Congress of People's Deputies here today, nine deputies spoke on issues that required urgent attention, although not on the official agenda.

Academician Andrey Vorobyev raised the issue of small ethnic groups and called for the revival of some cultural traditions that were sadly neglected.

A co-chairman of the Interregional Deputy Group (IDG) historian Yuriy Afanasyev read out a statement that the group found itself in actual opposition to the majority of deputies at Congress on a number of issues. These included the decision not to review Article 6 of the constitution postulating the leading and guiding role of the Communist Party and to approve the government programme for the normalisation of the country's economy which the group viewed as retarding the transition to a market-oriented economic management. The statement calls for a Supreme Soviet session in January to adopt necessary economic laws and the Third Congress of People's Deputies in February 1990.

Kazakhstan party chief Svyatoslav Medvedev described the statement s "Non-constructive and of a declarative nature". He said Afanasyev was stretching the point in an attempt to bring the issue to a head when he said that the Congress endorsed the communist Party's monopoly position in the country's political system by refusing to discuss Article 6. Medvedev also took exception to the "ultraradical" economic programme of the Interregional Deputy Group. He said its implementation would inevitably result in social and economic diseases—inflation, mass unemployment and bankruptcy of numerous enterprises.

One of the trade union leaders Gennadiy Yanayev was critical of the IDG position, too.

Valentina Golubeva, director of the Ivanovo integrated works, amused the Congress by proposing to rescind the decision to erect monuments to people who were awarded the country's top distinction, the title of a Hero of Socialist Labour, twice. "I propose to begin with myself," she said. "I feel embarrassed every time I see the monument to myself—I am alive, you see."

Officer Vladimir Lopatin spoke about problems of defence and the Army. He proposed to instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to draft, in time for the Third Congress of People's Deputies, a programme of military reform.

Poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko spoke very emotionally, as usual, about interrelations between the intelligentsia and the Army.

21 Dec Congress Proceedings Reviewed

LD2112213789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1321 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 21 Dec (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies—the supreme body of authority in the country—began its work in the Kremlin today. [passage omitted]

The deputies elected a working presidium composed of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, his first deputy, and his deputies, representing all the union republics. A congress secretariat was also elected.

For the first time, balloting was being conducted on the new electronic equipment from the Philips firm. There were, however, breakdowns, either because some deputies were unprepared or bacause of technical shortcomings. In any case, in one row the ballot had to be conducted by hand throughout the first session.

The congress failed to make much progress in the first half of the day. [passage omitted]

The proposal to discuss Article 6 at the congress was rejected by a majority vote.

Proposals were also made to change at the congress those clauses of the basic law which contradict the draft laws on ownership and land which have been approved by the Soviet parliament after the first reading. Another point of view was also heard in the course of the discussion: It is inexpedient to make amendments until the nationwide discussion of these documents has ended. As a result, the proposal on discussing amendments was not supported by a majority of deputies.

In the discussion of the issue of placing on the agenda the draft law on the status of people's deputies, which regulates the rights of deputies at all levels, a decision was made to examine a separate draft law on the status of a USSR people's deputy.

The discussion of the agenda will be continued at the evening session. It was originally planned that the report by Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet Government, on measures to improve the economy, would be heard today. However, it is difficult to predict how long the discussion on the agenda will last.

Further on Proceedings

LD2112222689 Moscow TASS in English 2213 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Thursday's session began with the admission that deputies had failed to confine themselves to the approved schedule. Fiery debates took a day and a half longer than planned, Mikhail Gorbachev said in opening remarks. Upon his proposal, the congress decided to prolong its work by two days and extend afternoon sessions by one hour.

The Congress then continued the discussion, begun on Wednesday, of three bills to regulate deputy activities. Only one of them was voted into law—on the status of people's deputies in the Soviet Union. It lays down uniform principles upon which the system of soviets is based throughout the country.

Lengthy debates on a separate bill on the status of deputies of the USSR yielded no final decision. A majority vote returned the bill to the USSR Supreme Soviet for further elaboration and approval.

Opinions about the bill on the procedure for recalling people's deputies differed so dramatically that the congress decided to hand the bill over to the USSR Supreme Soviet for elaboration and to reconsider it at the third congress of people's deputies. The bill will be published for voters to have their say on the matter.

Another major item of Thursday's agenda was the congressional debate on constitutional compliance. The bills on the matter were introduced by Dzhangir Kerimov, chairman of the Drafting Commission. He spoke of the need to establish, for the first time in the country's history, a special body to monitor constitutional compliance as federal and republican constitutional norms were often violated by orders and instructions issued by ministries and departments. Constitutional compliance acquires special significance during perestroyka when many new fundamental laws are promulgated.

The Committee for Constitutional Compliance should deal with regulatory enactments drafted by state bodies and public organisations, including the party, and acts already approved, including international treaty commitments of the Soviet Union and union republics.

In remarks after the report, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the establishment of a Committee for Constitutional Compliance will help strengthen law and order in the country. "We are advancing towards a rule-of-law state, and this committee should serve the interests of the law-governed state," he said.

Estonian lawyer Igor Gryazin spoke about a special opinion of four members of the preparatory committee who considered that the innovation in this field "not only fails to serve the reconstruction of the sovereign rights of union republics, but further curtails the rights that exist".

The discussion revealed that while a majority of speakers favoured the creation of a committee for constitutional compliance, arguments to the contrary were also voiced.

The congress will continue the discussion of the issue on Friday.

Chernavin Interviewed on Concerns as Deputy

PM2112122789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

["Interview on the Third Floor" with Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and deputy for Lenkoranskiy Territorial Okrug: "Peace for Your Home"; date and place of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A telephone call from Azerbaijan: "Meet our deputy—the commander in chief of the Navy—at the

Congress." Let him talk about the Congress and how he is carrying out our instructions." The telephone conversation suggested the theme of our conversation with Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, deputy for Lenkoranskiy Territorial Okrug.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] The problems of the Transcaucasus region are the most acute and most troubled in the country. What instructions did you receive from your voters?

[Chernavin] Events in Azerbaijan in connection with Nagorno-Karabakh give me no peace as a Communist, a deputy, and a man. It is no coincidence that this region has been described as a bleeding wound. Strife between Armenians and Azerbaijanis is what primarily alarms me. I want to tell voters: Let there be peace in your home.

Where possible, I have studied the situation that has taken shape and am still doing so. I am increasingly confirmed in my opinion that the intolerance and animosity (that is what is guiding some people's actions) are often based not only on the accumulated social problems but also on the political instability brought about by illegal anticonstitutional measures with regard to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. I am referring to such actions as, for instance, the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet's adoption of a resolution regarding the incorporation of the NKAO in their republic, which is in contravention of the USSR Constitution.

So, must it be said that voters' instructions apply to precisely these questions. But, of course, the problems in my electoral okrug are not confined to this.

Look: We have a surplus work force—unemployment, in effect—an economy that has been neglected in many respects, a most acute housing problem, and a poor medical service... So, is this easy to deal with? No, but it must be dealt with.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Our readers will probably not understand us and your voters would not understand you, Vladimir Nikolayevich, if you did not now comment on the well known USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Measures To Normalize the Situation in the NKAO."

[Chernavin] I agree. My opinion is as follows: If we want to build a law-governed state, we must now strive to ensure the supremacy of the law. That is why we must restore the activity of the NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies and its executive committee as rapidly as possible.

By and large the resolution is good and concrete. It does not violate anyone's rights and is designed to normalize the situation in the region with consideration for the interests of both the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples. Voters ask me many questions, which boil down to the following: Is the resolution ideal or not?

This document should hardly be regarded as ideal. Certainly a brief resolution cannot make provision for everything that stands in need of resolution.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What do you personally not like?

[Chernavin] To be frank, I will say that my voters are demanding the amplification of certain wordings. After studying the question, I decided to support them. Explanations are indeed necessary. That is why I and Azerbaijani deputies asked the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to examine obscure problems. This will help us find a way out of the crisis. But it is important now for both sides to strictly fulfill the resolution in question.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] You took the floor at the Congress 19 December and said that every deputy must only vote "for" or "against" the government program for economic recovery and that there must be no abstentions. What provoked this statement?

[Chernavin] Two things. First... Some deputies' speeches voiced the following idea: We will not vote since if we adopt the program we will also thus take responsibility for its implementation. I consider this stance unprincipled.

Economic recovery is a fundamental question not only for the Congress but also for the country as a whole. That is why we must be responsible. We are the people's elected representatives and must not only support the government program but also put it into effect with our voters. That is the second point.

Who are these voters? People who must fulfill our decisions. That is why I advocated roll-call voting. The voters will see which deputies are prepared to take responsibility and which shirk it.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Responsibility is always specific. You cited one of the region's problems—unemployment. Not only the central authorities but also the people's concrete representatives—deputies—can have their say here...

[Chernavin] Yes, that's also what I think.

Construction of canneries has begun in Lerik and Astara. So much produce is now rotting and remaining unharvested or unexported that you wonder how people put up with it before.

What else can be done? Shipbuilding sectors can be developed. It is planned to set up subsidiaries of the "Nord" Science-and-Production Association in Lenkoran and Port-Ilich. I appealed to the minister of the shipbuilding industry and described the situation, and he met us halfway. That is how we must act. There is nothing else to be done.

It transpired that the question can be resolved comparatively promptly. The design for an enterprise is already being developed in Kiev and it is planned to complete i

within the first 6 months of next year. Some 600 new jobs will be created in Lenkoran and another 150-200 in outlying areas.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What about individual labor activity?

[Chernavin] I may be reproached for being a legislator involved in minor questions. But, you understand, this is necessary, people expect it. There are splendid conditions in my okrug for the development of knitting: long-standing traditions, skilled craftsmen. Knitting machines, many knitting machines, are needed to increase employment.

The question of allocating such machines to individuals is being resolved. I am going to Lenkoran in January and will consult with the voters on these and other questions relating to life in the region.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] It is well known that the Congress is not approving deputies' demands for additional funds and for resources to be allocated to individual regions...

[Chernavin] That's right. We're not there to "eke out." I consider it intolerable for people to only go up to the Congress rostrum to extort funds and materials. But we must study promising questions relating to the development of our okrugs and the economic situation. I, for instance, am worried by road construction. There are few roads here, and they are neglected.

I will be ashamed to look people in the eyes if everything remains the same. That is why departments and executive bodies must be pestered. For instance, it has proved possible to complete construction of a highway in Astara. Lastly, construction of a road has begun in Lerikskiy Rayon. Roads are a lifeline in the mountains.

There is a great need for tractor equipment. A great deal is being done in a systematic fashion via state bodies. But we, military men, can also do what we can to help. It has, for instance, proved possible, to transfer 25 automobiles from the Caspian flotilla.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What about resolving military questions?

[Chernavin] They are most unpredictable. Mother-Heroine Nazarova from Yardymlinskiy Rayon asked me to hunt our her son, who was called up for duty and... "went missing." Wherever she turned, no one gave her a specific answer. It transpired that her son was serving peacefully in the railroad troops, only he had not written to his mother. Yet the problem could have been settled via the military commissariat, only people there failed to respond to her inquiries. Could I really have refused the woman when I received her letter?

Of late there have been a great many requests for sons to serve closer to home. My opinion is this: Developing the Armed Forces on the basis of regional or national formations is a profoundly erroneous viewpoint. Our Army and Navy can only resolve defense tasks on a countrywide scale, not for individual regions but for the country as a whole. Incidentally, the First Congress adopted a decision on this.

However, in those areas where there is an opportunity for young men to serve in conditions to which they are accustomed, that must be taken into consideration. For instance, it has already been decided to draft six times more Azerbaijani draftees into the Caspian Flotilla than is usually the case.

Legislation Panel Head Alekseyev Interviewed

PM2112115389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with S.S. Alekseyev, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, by S. Karkhanin under the rubric "Interview Before the Sitting": "The Law Is Stern, But It Is Still the Law"; date and place of interview not specified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] According to the tentative schedule for the Congress' work, people's deputies plan to embark on electing the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee any day now. M.S. Gorbachev announced in his speech at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum that it has been decided to recommend for the post of leader S.S. Alekseyev, who currently heads the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of Legislation, Legality, Law and Order.

This man is well known now throughout the country. His well thought-out, well considered speeches from the rostrum at the Supreme Soviet session cooled the strong passions raging in some speeches and made it possible to see the chance of a compromise even in those areas where it seemed unattainable. But the main thing is that the stance held by the chairman of the committee of deputies is always constructive and creative. That is why we asked S.S. Alekseyev questions that are now arousing particularly stormy polemics, notably among USSR people's deputies.

[Karkhanin] One of these questions, Sergey Sergeyevich, concerns the problem of compliance with the law. That is an inalienable part of a law-governed state, which we are building, but respect for existing legislation is literally disappearing before our eyes....

[Alekseyev] First, I will say that I do not like the term "compliance with the law" very much. After all this concept is designed for passive people. As if there is some center issuing laws and regulations and people are bound to obey them unquestioningly without a murmur. The ancient Romans had a good saying that went something like this: "Laws are written for those who keep watch." That is, a law-governed state with a developed legal system laws exists for active people who display initiative and implement legislation creatively. That is what we should be striving for.

[Karkhanin] But the vagueness of legal norms always impedes matters. Of late a number of articles have appeared in the press whose authors—people's deputies—claim that the protracted uncertainty with regard to their status is an obstacle in their daily work and has become intolerable. What is your opinion here?

[Alekseyev] I do not think that lack of status has presented a very great obstacle in the work of Supreme Soviet deputies. The lack of strict regulations may possibly free their hands and expand their opportunities and does not restrict their activity at all. Work would perhaps proceed better if the rights and duties of a deputy, the presidium, or the chairman were defined more clearly, but that is nonetheless not an issue which has a substantial effect on Supreme Soviet activity.

But the problem of status is indeed an acute one for deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet. They only have a consultative vote when decisions are adopted. This gives rise to some awkwardness and mental discomfort. In my view, those are the problems in the current organization of state power. Nor do deputies in the localities have proper rights.

On the other hand, some of our colleagues have raised the question of their opportunity to suspend local organs' decisions. That is also probably incorrect. A complicated system of "power centers" would be created and, as one of the leaders of such organs told me, he would simply resign his post. Although coordination is indisputably necessary. In short, we will have to complete our work on status at the Congress.

[Karkhanin] There are many disputes about situations where laws adopted in several union republics do not correspond with union legislation. The examples are well known. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has published a resolution on this subject. But aren't such steps being taken too cautiously? Whatever happens, we must all fulfill all-union legislation.

[Alekseyev] This is a very complex, subtle, and painful question which is linked with ethnic feelings and I would not like to provide categorical prescriptions here. Of course, a real law-governed state needs laws to be carried out. To ensure their sanctity, inviolability, and stability. But, to be frank, this process must be viewed from several angles. All-union legislation is slow in developing. In some republics the economy, social life, and ethnic relations are developing more rapidly. They are indeed faced with difficult tasks. How, for instance, can one switch to republic economic accountability if union legislation has not resolved these questions? A serious problem and one that we must not brush aside.

It is very easy to reproach others, but it is best if you draw conclusions for yourself. Throughout my life I have always tried to abide by the following rule: "Physician, heal thyself first." Thus, I believe that we are taking somewhat too long in publishing all-union laws and this is paving the way for the emergence of normative acts that do not correspond with the former in the republics. Conclusion—we must renew all-union legislation and the constitution more intensively.

[Karkhanin] But won't it be the case, Sergey Sergeyevich, that, on seeing such discrepancies, people will assume that they do not have to obey the laws.

[Alekseyev] I believe that our citizens understand the complexity of the lawmaking processes and will not directly extend these trends to themselves. Although such facts themselves do not of course help strengthen legality. The problem must be examined in all its complexity and we must understand its roots.

[Karkhanin] We often hear deputies complaining about the organization of Supreme Soviet work. Voices are heard saying that it is being manipulated by the apparatus or the presidium... Cases where various draft laws have fallen into the hands of session participants before the actual sitting where they were to be discussed are cited as proof. In your view, is there a grain of truth in such recriminations?

[Alekseyev] You have cited a somewhat extreme position. My personal viewpoint is different. There are indeed malfunctions in the work of the apparatus and they are sometimes brought about by lack of organization. But I do not believe that manipulation occurs. There are undoubtedly problems relating to poor organization and lack of clarity. But there is hardly any "malicious intent."

However, it is also worth looking at the facts from the stance you mentioned. But I do not share it nonetheless. As for the apparatus, we would probably have been unable to adopt major decisions such as the Law on the Lease without its help.

I think that the quest for some kind of deliberate "braking factor" in the Supreme Soviet echoes the dissatisfaction felt by many people at our sluggishness.

[Karkhanin] At the sessions you often succeed in finding points of contact even for diametrically opposed positions voiced by deputies. What guides you in this?

[Alekseyev] Professionalism and consolidation of effort help lawmaking. I admit that I oppose alternative drafts since they are fraught with confrontation. They may be used as working documents but it is hardly necessary for them to figure independently. I am given to "parallel" drafts, of which one may be used as a base. I am convinced that success will not be achieved through struggle and confrontation.

[Karkhanin] The interregional group of deputies intended to prepare alternative drafts but your committee has not as yet received such documents.

[Alekseyev] That may be a good thing. Many deputies from the interregional group work within the Supreme Soviet commissions and committees. If this work proceeds on a good constructive basis, it may eliminate the "problems" of democratization. I repeat: There can only

be real democracy based on unshakable respect for the law. The country's life can only be rendered normal with the help of developed legislation.

[Karkhanin] Certainly, "the law is stern, but it is still the law"... Nonetheless this Latin formula by no means always works as yet. Take economic offenses.. Figures have been published that attest to the gigantic scale of the damage incurred by the state.

[Alekseyev] I believe that in a number of cases such figures overdramatize the situation. It is well known that there are no clear-cut methods of calculation and everyone calculates as they please. Could the stress on "appalling" figures be a pretext for not developing democratic processes? Priority is given by and large to sensible approaches.

Although, of course, no one has taken off the agenda the fight against economic offenses and crimes closely linked with the organized crime problem. It is well known that we decided to put this question on the agenda at the current Congress of USSR People's Deputies and we intend to discuss it seriously within our committee.

People's deputies plan to examine the draft document on the procedure for applying measures to combat crime in critical conditions. I will stress: It is not a question of a special or an extraordinary situation. The document is designed to help law-enforcement bodies ensure that the laws are put into practice more effectively It does not impede democratization in the least and, I will say once again, must be implemented on the principles of the strictest legality.

Deputy Condemns Interregional Group Practices

LD2012122989 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

A radical Soviet deputy lashed out at the Interregional Group of Deputies (which has been dubbed "leftist-radical opposition" in the corridors of the continuing second congress) saying its working style was undemocratic.

"It is probably the last time I will take part in the group's work," Aleksandr Krayko, a non-partisan engineer who fought his way against local authorities in a Moscow constituency and who became one of the most active supporter of the Interregional Group at the first congress, told TASS.

"Democracy presupposes at least a chance to freely express one's point of view. This has become impossible in the group. During all meetings I attended, I could make only a five-minute speech, while the group's leaders were given unlimited time," he said, referring to the group's co-chairmen Boris Yeltsin, historian Yuriy Afanasyev and economist Gavriil Popov.

"All the meetings become rallies. Imagine the atmosphere at a meeting in a House of Films or a House of Actors (public halls in Moscow) where there are several hundred of 'fans' who take part in the discussion. It is impossible to speak against the prevailing viewpoint in these conditions," he said.

"I know very brave people who are not afraid to confront the congress presidium or contradict Gorbachev, but they are afraid to speak at the Interregional Group's meetings," Krayko said.

Members' speeches at the Second Congress were not approved by the group in advance, Krayko said.

"Neither were they discussed in its working groups. Rallies are a bad place to prepare serious documents."

Yakovlev on Role as Deputy, Party Leader

LD2112053989 Moscow World Service in English 0910 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Interview with CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member Aleksandr Yakovlev by unidentified correspondent; date, place not given; Yakovlev speaking in Russian with superimposed English translation—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Eighty-seven percent of the MP's attending the current Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow are affiliated with the Communist Party. To what extent are their freedom and independence compatible with the party affiliation and discipline? We have taken the question to one of these MP's, Aleksandr Yakovlev. [passage omitted]

[Yakovlev] I agreed to stand for election only after the party held its 19th conference. As long as there is action on the conference's decisions, I cannot see any clash between what I do as an MP and as a Communist. I support what the party had to say at that conference and I believe the decisions reached reshaped the interests of the nation and my own views. That's why I'll do all I can to counter any attempts to deviate from these decisions as a betrayal of the party. But if the party itself moves away from the principles of perestroyka, I won't feel myself bound by party discipline. For a truly democratic party, discipline means supporting its policy because you understand it and wish to promote it. If I disagree with the policy I'll say so openly. I won't play the hypocrite, and I certainly won't act against my conscience or against the nation's interests as I understand them. National interests are my key concern.

[Announcer] Asked what a party-affiliated MP must do if he differs on some matters with the party machinery, Aleksandr Yakovlev said:

[Yakovlev] No Communist MPs are duty-bound to support party policy. This doesn't mean they must bow to the opinions of just any party body. A party body, high as it may be, does not necessarily speak for the party. One of our troubles is that sometimes the party functionary

claims to be speaking on behalf of a party body, and this body on behalf of the whole party.

I feel quite independent of any party leader, even the topmost. The only guide for me as both MP and Communist are the party rules, and what the party decided at its latest conference.

[Announcer] It is noticeable at the current Congress that on some aspects of party work, Communists are more critical than their non-affiliated colleagues. How do the party's leaders feel about this? Do they see such criticism as an attack on the party's prestige and a breach of discipline? Aleksandr Yakovlev:

[Yakovlev] No MP has yet been accused of breaching party discipline despite views expressed, at least I've never heard of any party member being reproached for what he may have said in parliament.

Conduct, Attitude of Deputies Discussed

PM2112121789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Albert Plutnik commentary under the rubric "Publicist's View": "Will Hopes Be Fulfilled?"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] I know that the appeal from a group of people's deputies from the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] on N.I. Ryzhkov's report—which notes with regret that deputies have been offered only one version of economic reform, that there is now a kind of monopoly on the development of the concept of economic improvement, and that "neither the anonymous authors of single options nor the government have yet assumed responsibility for the consequences of the measures they propose"—is now being broadly discussed. But maybe the public discussion of this problem will serve as a guarantee? When it comes down to it, pluralism of opinions is nothing other than the possibility to voice any opinion, which no one is going to take into account anyway. But we must take into account the fact that the government document is the result of a vast amount of work by a large collective of people who value the interests of restructuring.

Now, as is well known, television broadcasts from the sessions hall are recorded rather than relayed live. But something else is even worse than this. When some speakers take the rostrum you often get the feeling that their speeches are also "recordings:" We have heard a lot of it several times before. That is the sensation you have when you hear appeals to "force the stronger sex to work and cut the chatter" and when demands are addressed to the leadership "to summon up the strength and will to overcome phrasemongering, instill order, and strengthen discipline." All these are familiar variations on the theme of the old life, which is still idealized by some but, to those who welcome the freedom of speech and democratic expression of will for which we have worked so long and hard, it is seen as nothing other than idle chatter and phrasemongering.

In my view, two groups are clearly distinguishable among those who have already addressed the congress. In the first group I would include everyone who, using the method of trial and error, is uneasily, sometimes painfully seeking the best possible solution to the economic crisis in which our country now finds itself—a solution which will allow us to achieve the greatest results while avoiding social unrest. These people—workers and members of the government, scientists and party officials—have, in particular, conducted a debate as to whether we should introduce a ration card system or not. Personally speaking, the government line inspires greater faith. In my opinion, introducing this kind of system would mean creating yet another unwieldy department which is just as ineffectual in its work as many that already exist. As far as I can see, it would mean creating a ministry of shortages with a vast staff and, what is more, there would be no ordinary people among them. Because everyone who "works in the shortages department" simply cannot be an ordinary person.

The second group should, in my opinion, include those who are not so concerned with getting at the truth as with digging in their heels and invariably sticking to their guns, come what may. They feel their opinion is the only right one. In this respect they try to put many people on their guard and make them suspicious of others' intentions and way of thinking. They say they want to dismantle the collective farm [kolkhoz] system (or the opposite: They prohibit everything in the countryside other than kolkhozes).... They are against private ownership (or the opposite: everything must be made private)....

Make people suspicious, intimidate them—oh, this is a profound philosophy. As a rule, its loyal followers appear to answer one blow with another: You have intimidated the people with the past—Stalinism and stagnation—they say, so we will intimidate them with the future—dark rather than bright.

However, it is good that the most diverse opinions are being publicly expressed. An open political struggle in the spirit of the time is thereby being waged at the congress and in society in general. Our future, the country's future, depends on the outcome of this struggle. This must determine the degree of responsibility of everyone who ascends the congress rostrum.

Foreign Media View of Congress Assessed

PM2112133789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Aleksandr Lyutyy roundup of foreign media commentaries on Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies: "View From Abroad"]

[Text] On the balcony from where journalists are following the debates at the Second Congress of USSR

People's Deputies a group of Western correspondents was passing round an impressively strong pair of binoculars.

I asked a reporter colleague what they were trying to see.

"Sometimes," he replied, "a gesture or turn of the head is enough to interest us. They indicate deputies' moods better than any words. Of course, we are primarily interested in your leaders."

"So how is it going: Is there material for sensation?"

"Frankly speaking, unlike the First Congress, sensations are a bit thin on the ground at this one. It is more calm, businesslike, and organized. The deputies are really working. Anyway, the debates in the U.S. Congress or the British Parliament are far from always an exciting spectacle."

The world is following the congress and following it closely. It is as if our internal problems are being discussed but the solutions are finding a response abroad. That is understandable. The evolution of the situation throughout the world depends to a considerable extent on the pace and direction of development of our country's reforms. The domestic and foreign policy aspects of the congress' work are very closely intertwined.

Several hundred foreign correspondents are the "eyes" and "ears" of the world in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. What are they primarily interested in? The congress decision not to include discussion of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution on the agenda and N.I. Ryzhkov's report have been the main subjects of comment these past few days.

As far as Article 6 is concerned, the Western mass media as a whole have received the results of the vote calmly, without surprise, and sometimes even with understanding. Assuming that this article of the Constitution will either be removed or changed in the future, a number of observers write that taking such a step now could lead to serious political polarization in society. This is how the U.S. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR views the situation: "Gorbachev's position can be compared to that of a dam dividing the left from the right.... Everything the Soviet leader does—from his useful meeting with Bush to his attempts to keep deputies' attention focused on his program—is designed to win time for restructuring. If the package of economic measures drawn up by Gorbachev and his assistants receives the Soviet parliament's stamp of approval, an important step will thereby have been taken."

The newspaper published its commentary before the government's economic program had received a firm vote of confidence at the Congress. It must be said that N.I. Ryzhkov's report has prompted various reactions in the West. A whole series of observers believe that, on the whole, the government has chosen the right course of gradual economic transformations, without any sudden, sharp movements that could plunge the country into a spiral of uncontrollable inflation, declining production, and unemployment. But sometimes commentaries have shown clear disappointment that the Soviet Union has not abandoned socialist principles in the economy, has not cast out state regulation, has not introduced private ownership, and has not moved toward the classic system of private enterprise. The newspaper USA TODAY believes that the Soviet Union has shown preference for "cosmetic repairs" instead of "economic surgery."

I cannot shake off the impression that some people had clearly been expecting the socialist economy to be buried at the congress and wanted us to tear down with our own hands everything of value that we have gained during the years of socialist development.

At a news conference, journalists asked Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, what he thinks about the pessimistic tone taken by some commentaries in the West.

"A number of U.S. observers," he said, "feel that our government is far too conservative in its conclusions and proposals. But, you know, there can be different viewpoints on state regulation and the market. I can say that in the European countries whose economic models we have closely studied (Italy, Sweden, France, and the FRG), the proportion of state regulation in the economy ranges from 38% to 70%. So it would be wrong to immediately abandon state planning, as some U.S. observers would like, and flop into the elemental waters of a market economy, as into an ice-hole, without being able to swim."

The section of our premier's report which discussed the question of perestroyka in the USSR's foreign economic relations did not escape observers' attention.

The questions of increasing the return on the development of foreign economic relations and improving the country's currency situation are also a source of concern to deputies. You are strongly aware of this during informal conversations at the congress. An article by our London correspondent recently published in PRAVDA, "Parade of Amateurs," which told how a mass of poorly trained commercial travelers have become frequent visitors abroad, prompted a definite response that could not be described as indifferent.

I asked A.S. Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, to comment on these incidents.

"Yes," he said, "recently the number of potential foreign trade partners inside our country has grown many times over. One of the most important tasks is to establish a streamlined system as quickly as possible to train the relevant cadre corps and enhance its competency. In the past, the Foreign Trade Ministry was responsible for all these questions, as the leading state department. Do not think that I am calling for some of the old forms of activity, but I do believe that a more careful attitude

must be taken to the positive experience accumulated by the Foreign Trade Ministry."

...So, the Congress is at work. It is working for us, for our economic revival, and for democracy. It is working for our prestige abroad.

Political & Social

Brazauskas Elected Lithuanian Party Leader

LD2212000689 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Excerpts] We start with news from the special congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

In one of the afternoon sittings the leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Aigirdas Brazauskas, informed the congress of his telephone conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev. Before that there was a telephone call from the alternate member of the Politburo, Georgiy Razumovskiy. According to Algirdas Brazauskas, the conversation was a very difficult one and Mikhail Gorbachev was very excited. He said the members of the party's Central Committee demanded to convene a special plenum and assess the resolutions of the Lithuanian communist congress and the very fact of the congress. Algirdas Brazauskas replied by saying that hasty conclusions should not be made, that perestroyka in Lithuania was a deep going process and talk of party split and separatist moods was groundless. Such is life, said Algirdas Brazauskas.

Mikhail Gorbachev said then that the issue would be discussed by a Politburo sitting. What the Politburo decided we already know. Algirdas Brazauskas noted that the congress decisions put Mikhail Gorbachev in a very complicated situation and therefore he should be supported.

The congress forwarded a telegram to the Politburo and Mikhail Gorbachev. It reads: The delegates of the 20th Congress of Lithuanian communists gathered for their forum, being fully aware of and giving all round support to the perestroyka and democratization processes of Soviet society. The decisions on the party's independence, adopted by the congress, do not at all mean a split in the party but search for new relations between parties and sincere desire to make contribution to deepening perestroyka. The congress decisions are an outcome of a collective search of the republic's communists and conform to the interests of the absolute majority of the Lithuanian population. The decisions aim at speeding up the implementation of the ideals of humanistic socialism. Therefore, the 20th congress of Lithuanian communists is confident that its resolutions will have support from the Central Committee leaders and all Soviet Communists interested in immediate success in renovating the Soviet Communist Party and the whole socialist society. Highly respected Mikhail Sergeyevich and Politburo members, accept our aspirations as a support to perestroyka pursued by the party.

Late tonight, in response to Moscow reaction, the congress decided to elect a new party leader without delay. Algirdas Brazauskas was nominated. He was elected the first secretary of the Central Committee and Central Committee Bureau member by the overwhelming majority of 816 votes. Nine delegates voted against.

Algirdas Brazauskas has given today a short interview to newsmen who are mostly interested to know more about the reaction of Mikhail Gorbachev on the decision of the Lithuanian communists to reorganize the Lithuanian Communist Party into an independent one. Mr Brazauskas said that a special plenary meeting of the CPSU will be held in Moscow on the issue of Lithuanian communists breaking away from the CPSU. Asked what party he was going to represent Algirdas Brazauskas replied that he was ready to represent only the independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

Further on Brazauskas

LD2112224789 Moscow TASS in English 2233 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 22 TASS—By TASS Special Correspondents Anatoliy Aladinskiy and Yuriy Sizov:

The 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party underway here elected Algirdas Brazauskas, 57, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, on Thursday night.

He will head the party organisation which has been reorganised at the forum of Lithuanian Communists into the independent Communist Party of this Soviet Baltic repubic.

Brazauskas has been heading Lithuania's party organisation from the Autumn of 1988.

As it has been reported earlier, the delegates of the 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party were sent on Thursday a message signed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The message says that "the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, having familiarised itself with a report on the decision of your congress to reorganise the Lithuanian republican organisation of the Soviet Communist Party into an independent Lithuanian Communist Party holds that this decision should be assessed only as a step aimed at the split of the Lithuanian Communist Party from the Soviet Communist Party. In view of the fact that this concerns not only the Lithuanian Communist Party but the entire party, the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee decided on an undelayed convocation of a plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee."

21 Dec Lithuanian Congress Proceedings Reported

1400 GMT

LD2112183889

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 21 December resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress proceedings held in Vilnius. At 1405 GMT, it is announced that the commission on the party statute has not yet completed its work.

At 1412 GMT the chairman of the auditing commission replies to inquiries by deputies, which primarily concern the party's financial problems. No vote is taken.

At 1422 GMT, a vote is taken on the statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party, paragraph by paragraph. The chairman of the commission gives details of each amendment in each paragraph.

At 1455 GMT voting on the statute's amendments continues.

At 1500 GMT a vote is taken on the statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party after the amendments were introduced: 795 votes for, 10 against, and 12 abstentions. The statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party is adopted.

Following the vote, First Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas addresses the congress as follows:

"Comrade Gorbachev (?phoned me) and expressed his great concern that we, the Communist Party of Lithuania, have become independent, as it was said, that we were separating from [words indistinct]. Comrade Gorbachev was asked by many deputies during the congress—and there are many Central Committee members among them—what is happening to the Lithuanian Communist Party. [passage indistinct]

"The text of yesterday's declaration and the resolution—we explained that, indeed, such documents have been adopted. [words indistinct] this by no means is a confrontation or separation, not an isolation from [words indistinct] CPSU, that relations are not strictly defined up to the 28th congress, that we are preparing—as I already mentioned—to adopt proposals for the 28th congress. But this conversation was [words indistinct]. Comrade Gorbachev was very excited, [words indistinct] members of the committee are asking him various questions. Thus it would be expedient to convene in the near future a CPSU Central Committee plenum and assess [words indistinct] decisions, this very fact. I said that one should not draw any hasty conclusions, that restructuring has deeply affected the party and this is felt in this republic, in the life of our party, in the life of the Lithuanian Communist Party, that this by no means speaks of a split or of some sort of separatist mood. This is life, and life is as it is. Eighty-four percent favor an independent Lithuanian Communist Party; I explained it to him once again. He told me that today a sitting of [word indistinct] will take place and it will be decided what attitude on all this should be adopted. As I understand there will be (?certain conditions). This is information I have at the moment. If there is any further information I will report to the congress."

Brazauskas continues: "[Words indistinct] and I would like to ask you to accept my proposal: It is essential to support Comrade Gorbachev. He is in a very complicated position indeed. we think, that it would be expedient to prepare such a message from our congress, from our congress to the Central Committee, and maybe, ask to read it to the Congress of People's Deputies, because there are many members of the Central Committee, explaining [words indistinct] to the Communist Party, that are [word indistinct] of the congress. Such a message (?is being prepared)."

1508 GMT

LD2112191389

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1508 GMT on 21 December continues broadcasting its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress proceedings held in Vilnius.

At 1508 GMT chairman of the credentials commission announces that at the moment there is no need to discuss the position of 135 delegates who split from the main body of the Lithuanian Communist Party. It is stated that the Lithuanian Communist Party is not being changed, it is being reorganized.

At 1515 GMT Valerijonnas Baltrunas, secretary for ideology of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, begins his report. The speaker refers to the first and the second variants of the program. He mainly concentrates on the second variant. Valerijonas Baltrunas mentions certain points: Lithuanians should learn from positive ides of Leninism and Leninism should not be rejected altogether. Speaking specifically on party's policies he mentions that priority should be given to the agroprom and to price control. concerning the arts he says that the creative work of artists should not be controlled, althought, he says, the importance of Marxism-Leninism for culture should be accentuated democratically.

V. Baltrunas comments on church and religion and says that the party should cooperate with the clergy in moral education. He also mentions tht historical research is also of great importance. V. Baltrunas says that the Lithuanian Communist Party should adhere to the principles of internationalism of Marxism-Leninism. The speaker goes on to say that the Lithuanian aspiration for independence is natural, and it should be understood by other republics too.

At 1530 GMT, V. Baltrunas concludes his speech. Work resumes and the congress then adjourns until 1610 GMT.

At 1620 GMT, Justas Paleckis begins reading an alternative report on the program of the Lithuanian Communist Party. He says: "there can be no genuine internationalism until the self-determination of nations has been implemented. However, we must see our nation in the context of the community of all nations of the world and not in an egocentric way. Yet another statement is pressing too: The Lithuanian Communist Party must ensure that the culture and education of all national minorities living in Lithuania is being developed that conditions are provided to them to maintain links with their historical motherland. Here are some critical remarks. The harm inflicted on the Lithuanian national culture, I think, is analyzed in too fine a detail in the chapter: the party and the culture. These wounds of the past are still very painful, however, the main point lies not in listing all of them, but in creating a firm political system which will make the recurrence of the past impossible."

Paleckis continues: "The culture, first of all, comes to us through one mother tongue, through native literature and folklore, through the traditions of the family and everyday life, through national and religious rites, rituals, and so on. Thus, while liberating the culture from ideological alientation, from forced cosmopolitization [as heard] and forced atheisation [as heard], we are rehabilitating a free personality in the most natural national environment. development of a free personality is the aim of culture and, by the way, that of socialism as Marx understood it."

Paleckis goes on: "It seems that at this congress we should declare to the people of Lithuania that communists renounced the role of builders, which turned out to be not only unrealistic but also disastrous. Lithuanian Communists will try to be consistent supporters of nationality awareness and social justice; they will try to become the initiators of socialism filled by a Lithuanian content, by all nationalities living in Lithuania, and by their best traditions. In a nutshell our ideal is not Hungarian or Russian, it is not Swedish or German Socialism, it is socialism marked by Lithuanian colors."

1630 GMT

LD2112204589

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian on 21 December continues broadcasting its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress proceedings held in Vilnius.

Justas Paleckis continues his alternative report on the Lithuanian Communist Party's program: "I would like to speak briefly about relations with the CPSU. Let us ask yourselves this question today: Can we cooperate with the CPSU as we would with any other party abroad? Can we (?talk) to Gorbachev and Gorbunov? To Yakovlev and Savisaar, to Valjas and Shevardnadze like we would to Marchais and Vogel, to Werner and N. Kinnock, Gysi and Adamec?

"At least at this stage the above-mentioned leaders of social democratic and communist parties would give us a polite gesture to our fervent desire to establish close contacts with them. But what about the upper line of the well-known names? It is simply mandatory to talk to these political figures, to discuss and lead complex negotiations. This rather difficult task will fall on the shoulders of the newly elected bureau and the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party."

Paleckis continues: "Who is our staunchest ally outside Lithuania, supporting us at this stage on the road to democracy which also inevitably means on the road to independence as well? such an ally is, was, and I believe, will be the progressive and reform-seeking part of the CPSU, the activity of which is well-foundedly associated with Gorbachev's name."

The session breaks from 1730 GMT to 1810 GMT.

At 1810 GMT the congress' work resumes. Delegate Karazija proposes to elect only the first secretary today. He proposes Algirdas Brazauskas. Much applause follows this proposal. Then delegates are invited to nominate alternative candidates. However, no other candidates are proposed. It is announced that the first secretary will be elected by a secret ballot.

At 1830 GMT telegrams of support are read; telegrams from Kharkov, Moscow, Riga, Tbilisi, Leningrad, and other places in the USSR. These were sent by individuals, as well as by party organizations, to wish the independent Lithuanian communist party all the best in their work as an independent communist party. An unidentified delegate proposes that now this congress should carry on working according to this party's new statute, which states that the congress can elect the first secretary.

At 1840 GMT work is adjourned. The congress resumes work at 1925 GMT. Amendments to the draft regulations on party administration elections are then discussed. It is pointed out that the congress must elect the first secretary. The party organs elections regulations are adopted: For—785; against—none. It is announced that A. Brazauskas is currently at a news conference. The election commission announces the election procedure.

At 1945 GMT radio correspondent announces that delegates have left the hall for the foyer where the ballot boxes are. Algirdas Brazauskas is the only candidate for the first secretary's post. The election results are not given.

At 1950 GMT the live relay concludes. In the following newscast, it is announced that a telegram from the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress was sent to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to explain the Lithuanian Communist Party's objectives.

Lithuanian Congress Delegate Criticizes Plans

LD2112213189 Moscow TASS in English 2110 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 21—By special TASS Correspondents Anatoliy Aladinskiy and Yuriy Sizov:

The decision of the alternative party conference of the 20th congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania is explained by the striving of that part of delegates to remain in the ranks of the Soviet Communist Party, Vladislav Shved, first secretary of the Oktyabrskiy District Party Committee of Vilnius, a participant in the alternative conference, said in the press centre of the party forum.

He is of the opinion that the intended adoption by the Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party of its own programme and regulations "is not only premature, but also runs counter to the existing rules of the Soviet Communist Party."

"We suggested at the congress to put this question to a referendum of the entire party of the republic and then to submit proposals to the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party," Shved said.

"In view of the complexity of the political situation in the republic and in the whole of the country, it would be expedient to hold an all-union party forum earlier," he said.

Explaining the reasons for which the participants of the alternative party conference, while continuing to participate in the congress, abstain from voting on the draft programme and rules, he said that members of the Soviet Communist Party, according to the party's rules, have no right to vote for a programme of another independent party.

He said that the proclamation by the congress of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania of its own rules and programme is virtually a break from the Soviet Communist Party.

Speaking about the need for the renewal of the Soviet Communist Party, he noted that the party's restructuring is not quick enough. But the road to the party's and society's renewal is our unity, he said.

"The split in the country and the party is impermissible. It is impossible to overcome the crisis on one's own," he said.

Gorbachev Calls for Central Committee Plenum

LD2112184689 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—The following message to the delegates of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania was circulated here today:

"The Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, having familiarised itself with a report on the decision of your congress to reorganise the Lithuanian republican organisation of the Soviet Communist Party into an independent Lithuanian Communist Party holds that this decision should be assessed only as a step aimed at the split of the Lithuanian Communist Party from the Soviet Communist Party. In view of the fact that this concerns not only the Lithuanian Communist Party but the entire party, the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee decided on an undelayed convocation of a plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee".

The message was signed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

'Vremya' Views Lithuanian Party Changes

LD2112222289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Video report by A. Paulyas and V. Beketov on 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress—from "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Paulyus] Today is the third day of the congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CP]. The Communists are beginning this day in their new capacity, as it were. Late last night voting took place on the status of the Lithuanian CP, and 855 out of 1,033 delegates present spoke in favor of an independent communist party of Lithuania with a program and status of its own. A number of other important documents have been adopted. Thus, the Lithuanian CP has acquired its full, so to speak, independence, possessing its own code of regulations and its own program.

[Beketov] Will this remove the problems that have piled up or give rise to fresh ones? What do you think?

[Petkyavichus, writer, identified by screen caption] I believe that this will remove most problems. And of course, it will also give rise to some new ones. Every phenomenon has its own negative and positive aspects. Therefore, I do not think that there will be no problems whatsoever in the future. The thing is that we are doing this for the first time. But the path which we have now chosen seems to me the most correct. The time will come, and all the republics will have parties of their own. Otherwise no democratization will take place. All the parties will be cooperating, so to speak, on a parity basis. We all will be striving for the same thing—to make our respective areas prosperous and to cooperate with one another. I do not discern in this anything special—well, how shall I put it—as some militant comrades from both sides do.

[Video shows meeting in progress] [Paulyus] At the congress many various statements, demands, and declarations could be heard. The following statement aroused a particularly stormy reaction:

[S.I. Nagornyy, secretary of the Vilnius ATP-8 Enterprise party committee, identified by screen caption] We delegates who have voted for an independent Communist Party of Lithuania of the CPSU under renewal have adopted a decision on holding a party conference. The purpose of this conference is the consolidation of Lithuanian Communists who share the idea of an independent Communist Party of Lithuania within the CPSU. The talk about this continued in the corridors.

[Video shows Beketov with three men in foyer of congress hall] [Beketov] There are 160 of you who voted for the second option, that is for the preservation of the Lithuanian CP as part of the CPSU. But it was the first option that has won. And now the situation is completely different.

[S.Ye. Rudenko, captain of the fishing fleet, identified by screen caption] A majority vote does not yet mean a victory. And today shows that many things here remain as they used to be. If there is a new independent Communist Party of Lithuania, or perhaps it does already exist, strange as it may seem, our party membership cards still remain the same. Already this shows something.

Vilnius Radio Carries 22 Dec Lithuanian Congress

0800 GMT

LD2212101689

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0800 GMT on 22 December begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress in Vilnius.

The session is chaired by Algirdas Brazauskas, who outlines the proceedings. He says that the most important documents have now been adopted. Therefore, organizational issues will be discussed today.

The session proceeds with the election of secretaries. Brazauskas proposes five secretaries, one of them solely responsible for agriculture. This proposal is rejected. A delegate proposes that Brazauskas should form the group of secretaries himself for he is going to carry out the work.

J. Paleckis says that a party which is a competitive political par should have a sound economic policy, otherwise the party will not be taken seriously.

At 0820 GMT, the debate on electing secretaries continues.

At 0835 GMT, the debate is discontinued. The main proposals are for five secretaries, three secretaries, or four secretaries. At this point the working presidium is invited to withdraw for consultations and the work of the congress was adjourned.

At 0843 GMT, relay ends and music is played.

At 0855 GMT, the relay resumes. A. Brazauskas announces that four secretaries should be elected and not five: The first secretary for general matters; the second secretary for internal party matters; the third secretary to deal with spiritual matters of the people—Brazauskas says he deliberately avoided the term ideology because this term has acquired some undesirabe connotations—and the fourth secretary to deal with the economy and ecological problems. A. Brazauskas further outlines in more detail how the four secretaries will implement the adopted party program.

A vote was taken on the proposal to elect four secretaries; 692 vote in support of this proposal.

A vote is taken on the proposal to elect three secretaries; 123 vote in favor. Therefore, four secretaries of the Lithuanian communist party will be elected.

At 0908 GMT, the quorum of the congress is verified: 854 delegates are present.

At 0910 GMT, Brazauskas takes the floor. He voices his proposal of Vladimiras Beriozovas for the post of second secretary: 828 delegates support the nomination.

To the post of third secretary, Brazauskas nominates Justas Paleckis, to be responsible for foreign relations, culture, and spiritual matters of the people of this republic. The overwhelming majority support this nomination. Gagiliene is proposed as an alternative candidate to the post. she refuses to be included in the list of nominees.

Kestutis Glaveckas is nominated for the post of fourth secretary. Another proposal is to nominate Bronislovas Zaikauskas for the post. Zaikauskas refuses to stand. Deputy Rajackas is then proposed. He also refuses to be nominated.

K. Glaveckas is the only candidate for the post of fourth secretary.

At 0925 GMT, a break is announced. The vote will be conducted during the adjournment.

The length of the adjournment is not specified.

1050 GMT

LD2212121289

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1050 GMT on 22 December continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress session in Vilnius, following a musical interlude during the adjournment.

At this point, Vermak, party secretary of the 'komunaras' factory makes a statement which reveals what actions the pro-Moscow fraction is planning to undertake. Speaking in Russian, he says:

"Comrades, allow me to make a statement for your information. My name is Vermak. I am party committee secretary at the 'komunaras' works.

"On 21 December 1989 a conference of the delegates to the congress who stand for the idea of a self-dependent Lithuanian Communist Party within the renewed CPSU continued its work. The participants in the conference discussed the assessment made by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo of the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the contents of the message of CPSU General Secretary Comrade Gorbachev to the congress. The conference examined a number of organizational problems and discussed a draft message of the conference to the communists of Lithuania. The conference is receiving messages of response from the republic's communists supporting the self-dependence of the Lithuanian Communist Party within the renewed CPSU. The participants in the conference appealed to their supporters not to take part in the elections of the leading organs of the Lithuanian Communist Party held on the basis of the program and statute adopted on 21 December.

"On 22 December, the conference will examine the problem of electing a temporary organ to prepare for holding a forum of the republic's communists who stand for the idea of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party within the renewed CPSU."

At 1058 GMT, A. Brazauskas announces that the work of the congress is adjourned until 1300 GMT. He said that during the break delegates will elect the four secretaries. The results should be known after the adjournment.

1308 GMT

LD2212134389

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1308 GMT on 22 December resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress session in Vilnius.

Registration of the deputies for afternoon sitting is conducted. There are 822 delegates present at this sitting.

The results of the elections of the central committee secretaries are announced: For second secretary, Vladimiras Beriozovas: 799 votes in favor, 45 against. He is elected second secretary by a majority of votes.

For third secretary, Justas Paleckis: 798 votes in favor and 46 against. Paleckis is elected third secretary by a majority of votes.

For fourth secretary, Kestutis Glaveckas: 798 votes in favor and 48 against. Glaveckas is elected by a majority of votes.

The election of secretaries of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee is concluded at 1322 GMT.

1323 GMT

LD2212153589

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1323 GMT on 22 December continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress session in Vilnius.

Delegate Gricius takes the floor to read two statements. One of them condemns the culprits for the bloody repressions in Romania and the other condemns the invasion of Panama by its superpower neighbor.

Following this, discussions are held on the two statements. Various opinions were voiced. The statements are not endorsed by the congress.

At 1336 GMT, delegates started discussing a report on the action program of the party. The proposed amendments are read. The delegates have the draft program with them and introduce the amendments in pencil. The speaker refers to specific places in the text asking delegates to change a word or the whole structure of a phrase.

At 1407 GMT, the speaker anounces that the draft policy on ecology has been rewritten. Therefore, the text is read in order to acquaint the delegates with it.

In the amendments to the chapter on the Soviet Armed Forces, the sentence concerning the position of Lithuanian youth doing their military service is amended to read that the party will defend the interests and dignity of Lithuanian young men serving in the Soviet Armed Forces.

At 1425 GMT, a question is raised about whether staff members of the party apparatus can be elected to the elective organs of the party.

At 1450 GMT, a debate on the composition of the Central Committee begins.

At 1505 GMT, procedural debates continue but the relay is discontinued. The announcer says the reason for this is that the debate is tedious for the listeners because no pressing problems are being solved. The announcer says that the relay will be resumed "in due course."

Commission Report on Lithuanian Komsomol

PM0311163189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 3

["Information Report of All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, Komsomol, Commission Studying Problems Relating to 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress"]

[Text] The political situation in Lithuania, which was characterized by the idea of republic state autonomy which prevailed in virtually all strata of the native population and which was underpinned by specific decisions adopted by republic state and party organs and various social organizations and movements, above all Sajudis—the People's Movement for Restructuring—

exerted the main influence on the preparation for and conduct of the 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress. The decisions of the 18 May 1989 session of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, which adopted amendments to to the Lithuanian SSR Constitution geared toward full Lithuanian state autonomy received great support in the republic.

The sociopolitical situation prevailing in the republic, the general crisis within the Komsomol, the policy pursued by the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee heedless of possible consequences, and the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee's dilatoriness in tackling urgent problems brought about the "reconstitution" at the 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress of a new autonomous sociopolitical organization—the Lithuanian Communist Youth League—on the basis of the Lithuanian Komsomol.

This decision was attributed to a desire to restore historical justice concerning the fact of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League's forcible incorporation within the structure of the All-Union Komsomol in 1940. However, no historical material at all corroborating this was submitted to the congress.

Study by All-Union Komsomol Central Committee commission members together with academics from the Baltic republics of the documents of party and Komsomol organs and accounts indicates that the voluntary nature of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League's entry cannot be questioned from either the factual or logical standpoint.

The absence in the archives of documents containing requests by the Baltic republic youth leagues to be accepted within the All-Union Komsomol indicates no more than a breach of procedure and in no way a lack of desire to enter the all-union organization. On the contrary, all the documents and publications and speeches by the leaders of the Communist Youth League and Komsomol of Lithuania in both 1940 and subsequent years stress that the Lithuanian Komsomol accepted entry to the All-Union Komsomol with gratitude and considered this an honor and an event of great importance which exerted a favorable influence upon its further development.

The reason given for "reconstituting" the Lithuanian Communist Youth League is contentious for the following basic reasons: As distinct from 1940, the new Statutes and Program adopted by the Lithuanian Communist Youth League are fundamentally different, the symbols have changed, and the organization is formed on a quite different quantitative and qualitative basis.

The All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Commission notes that in the period since the 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress no substantial changes have occurred in the republic Komsomol organizations' activity and the new league has not yet started active organizational and propaganda work. Komsomol members are not fully acquainted with the decisions of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League congress, see no fundamental differences between the Statutes of the All-Union Komsomol and the Lithuanian Communist Youth League, and are passive.

A one-sided interpretation of the events occurring in the republic, where political, social, and ideological problems are taking on a national hue, is perceptible in the activity of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee and city and rayon committees (gorkom, raykom). The course of national revival is often regarded as the sole fact of political life and the basic priority. Komsomol cadres who are CPSU members have wittingly breached the statutory norms of party and Komsomol life and make statements which are out of keeping with party ethics.

Confusion and uncertainty is observable among a considerable segment of Komsomol cadres and the aktiv, as answers to many questions of an organizational and political nature have yet to be found. Here many people are sure that the All-Union Komsomol should supply answers to them. However, there is also the conviction that the congress adopted the only correct decisions enabling the communist youth movement in the republic to be saved.

Given the declining membership of organizations, Komsomol gorkoms and raykoms are streamlining their apparatuses and have concentrated on seeking various forms of economic activity. There is no political work being carried out among the masses and further steps by cadres and the aktiv are made dependent on how the political situation shapes up and how the discussion within the republic party announced at the 18th Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee 18th Plenum turns out.

Work to prepare a normative base for the league is being carried out by the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee, payment of membership dues is being recorded on a departmental basis, and reregistration of All-Union Komsomol members has started. Conversations with Komsomol workers and the aktiv enable the following conclusion to be drawn, namely, that membership of organizations will go down considerably during reregistration and most remaining Lithuanian Komsomol members will switch to the Lithuanian Communist Youth League. It is clear that All-Union Komsomol organizations will be preserved in the republic. The Komsomol organizations of the "Baltiya" ship building plant, the Zapadnyy ship repair plant, and other plants in the city of Klaypeda, the Oktyabrskiy Rayon of the city of Vilnius, Ignalinskiy, Shalchininkskiy, and a number of other rayons have stated their reluctance to join the Lithuanian Communist Youth League and are demanding that they retain their membership of the All-Union Komsomol. Komsomol members could split along national lines.

The situation in which the Lithuanian Communist Youth League finds itself is complex, vague, and contradictory. There is a lack of clear philosophical bases. In these conditions where fundamental basic problems are unresolved the Communist Youth League is attempting to build an edifice on shaky foundations. You get the impression that emotion rather than reason, theory, or logic prevailed in the congress' decisions. The congress essentially constituted itself as a new organization, although delegates were elected from Lithuanian Komsomol organizations. In the commission's opinion there were insufficient grounds for delegates to take such crucial decisions. The decision to disband the Lithuanian Komsomol has not been accepted, the documents do not stipulate the fate of the minority of Lithuanian Komsomol members who disagree with the adopted documents.

The commission has prepared its conclusions and proposals on the basis of work in the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee and the Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaypeda, Ignalina, Kretinga, Radvilishkis, Zarasay, Shvenchenis, Trakay, and Shalchininkay Komsomol organizations. Meetings and conversations were held with a wide circle of the Komsomol aktiv and other Lithuanian social movements, and the proceedings of the 22d Lithuanian Communist Youth League Congress and the youth press were studied.

Participants in the conference of Lithuanian Communist Youth League gorkom and raykom first secretaries held on 11 September 1989 and Comrade A.-M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, were acquainted with the results of the commission's work.

The Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee plenum of 13 October 1989 was addressed on the commission's behalf by Comrade A.S. Bochurov, deputy general director of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee "Molodaya Gvardia" publishing production association. He informed the plenum of the conclusions and proposals prepared by the commission. Compromise solutions to problems arising in the period prior to the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress were proposed to plenum participants. In particular, the opinion was expressed that the reregistration of Komsomol members which is now under way be halted, that measures aimed at breaking up the organization not be taken, and that the opportunity be afforded and the conditions created for joint work by members of the All-Union Komsomol and the Lithuanian Communist Youth League, without setting one off against the other. With the achievenment of such an accord it would be possible to avoid the emergence of two Komsomol organizations in the republic and the adoption of measures in the period up to the All-Union Komsomol congress concerned with dividing up property and financial resources, which is inevitable with the creation of parallel structures. This would also make it possible to solve questions connected with registering Komsomol members when they move and with the normal functioning of the Sputnik youth travel bureau, the Lithuanian SSR Committee of Youth Organizations, the republic SO [expansion unknown] staff, and certain other questions.

Stopping reregistration would also make it possible to solve such a fundamental question as the participation of representatives of the Lithuanian Komsomol in the work of the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress as delegates.

However, the commission's proposed compromises were rejected by the plenum without serious discussion. The All-Union Komsomol Central Committee was highhandedly told to sign an agreement with the Lithuanian Communist Youth League. The plenum participants exhibited a reluctance to examine the substance of the commission's conclusions and proposals, to treat its standpoint with respect, to weigh up the pros and the cons, or to analyze the arguments and facts adduced.

Leading workers of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League briefed the plenum on their relations with the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee unobjectively, tried to set public opinion against the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee, and accused it of seeking to discredit the Lithuanian Communist Youth League as an autonomous political organization, of "interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign league," of trying to split the Lithuanian Komsomol along national lines, and of taking measures to install Komsomol structures in the republic parallel to those of the Communist Youth League.

An attempt was made by the commission to understand the prevailing situation in a respectful, in-depth, and objective manner. The main thing that guided the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee members was a desire to find a possible solution, to prevent a split, to maintain the best traditions, and to impart a new quality to them.
[Signed] All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Commission.

Army Paper Views Lithuanian Party Congress

PM2012194589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Report by special correspondent Colonel V. Gavrilenko: "To Listen to Each Other. Extraordinary, 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress Has Opened in Vilnius"]

[Text] Vilnius, 19 Dec—The congress opened at the Vilnius Opera Theater 19 December. Procedural questions took up 2 hours, and I admit that this struck me as somewhat unusual—for we are accustomed to seeing the main speaker mount the rostrum almost straight after the official opening of congresses and conferences. But this time it was different...

The following agenda took shape after a sharp debate: 1. The political report of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee to the 20th congress. Main speaker—A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. 2. On the statute of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Main speaker—V. Berezov, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. 3. On the draft program of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Main speakers—V. Baltrunas and Yu. Paletskis, secretaries of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. 4. The Auditing Commission's report. 5. Extraordinary action program of the Lithuanian Communist Party and other questions.

Vote followed vote, and I tried to make out on the press center monitor screen whether the hands of the congress' military delegates, of the emissaries from the party organizations of units stationed in Lithuanian territory, were going up together with all the rest. They were...

At a news conference the day before the congress V. Baltrunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, reported that among the 1,038 delegates, 40 officers were elected to the Lithuanian Communist Party congress. And he expressed the opinion that it would be correct if the votes of these Communists permanently resident and working in the republic did not influence the resolution of important problems.

This should be understood as follows—depriving military delegates of the right to vote at the congress. In the name of what? In my view, in the name of calming those Lithuanian Communists who, to put it mildly, look disapprovingly on the presence of Soviet Army units on Lithuanian territory. So that Army party members cannot, God forbid, upset the balance of forces in a vote on acute items on the agenda.

The military delegates protested. This necessitated a meeting between members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and Army Communists. At the meeting, which was held in the evening on the eve of the congress, the proposal was again put to military delegates that they renounce the right to vote. And by that time something had already been done in this regard. Either deliberately or as an oversight the military delegates had not been issued with voting cards.

There was a pointed discussion at the meeting. A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke. He assessed the situation on the eve of the congress in the party and in the republic. And again the thought was expressed that the right of military men to vote at the congress would still further exacerbate the situation. The officers and generals who spoke firmly declared that depriving military delegates to the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress of the right to vote runs counter to democratic and moral principles. In the end the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau gave a firm promise that no discriminatory steps would be taken. And the congress itself later confirmed the Army delegates' right to vote.

What made the 2-hour debate on procedural questions interesting? In my view, several aspects. Of all the forms of voting, which will take place at the congress on important items on the agenda, the congress, for example, chose rollcall voting. An overwhelming number of delegates are convinced of the need for it. It was decided to apply the principle of 50 plus 1 in voting—that is, a question is considered adopted if it has received more than half the votes. The congress accepted a quorum of two-thirds of the delegates attending the sitting.

It is, of course, no easy matter to analyze the report of A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, right after the event. I will say merely that it contains political, socioeconomic, and historical assessments of life in the republic. But I would single out two aspects. The first is the Communist Party statute. In speaking of it, the main speaker emphasized that there are three views on the future of the republic party organization. According to one of these, the Lithuanian Communist Party is an autonomous, organizationally and economically independent party with its own program and statute; it builds its relations with the CPSU and the republics' Communist Parties on partnership principles. The second and third views—secession from the CPSU, and the Communist Party as a constituent part of the CPSU—are, in the main speaker's opinion, extreme. It is emphasized that splitting the republic Communist Party would be disadvantageous to Lithuanian Communists...

And the second aspect of the report—the military aspect. The main speaker named the presence of Soviet Army units on Lithuanian territory as one of the most acute problems. He pointed out that this question was not invented by someone but dictated by life itself. People in Lithuania cannot tolerate the fact that nonregulation relations exist in the Army, in which Lithuanian youths sometimes suffer. These problems must be resolved, the main speaker emphasized. But without feverish haste.

Under conditions of the restoration of Lithuanian statehood, the main speaker pointed out, it is frequently maintained that the Soviet Army must be pulled out of the republic and replaced by national formations. It is necessary to think about this and seek advice. This includes consulting with the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Union Government, and the Ministry of Defense. This has been started. But it is hard now to imagine the decentralized defense of the country, including that of Lithuania. Another aspect is the service of Lithuanian youths in the Army and their protection. The first steps are being taken here. A military commission of the republic Supreme Soviet has been set up to tackle these questions.

Words from the report come to mind, which I cite from memory: Let us listen to each other, listen to ourselves....

I would like to hope that this will happen.

Latvian Electoral Commission Head Interviewed

90UN0339A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 5 Oct 89 p 2

[Interview with G.A. Blum, head of the Latvian Central Electoral Commission, by E. Lapidus: "No Right To Go Wrong"]

[Text] Once again political and public organizations and labor outfits (some successfully, others, by habit, in no hurry) are initiating an election campaign. The work that lies ahead is not only serious but also of extraordinary scale: People's deputies of rayon, city, Riga Rayon, community and rural soviets have to be elected—some 14,500 persons altogether. Also of considerable importance is the fact that almost 9,000 deputies fewer than previously are to be elected now. Good things come in small packages, as they say.

It is not difficult to predict the high intensity of the election struggle which will accompany this most important event in the life of the republic.

The okrug boundaries and the composition of the electoral commissions have been determined, and the nomination of candidates for people's deputy is about to begin.

A distinguishing aspect of the political campaign which has just gotten under way is that all electoral problems are to be solved on the basis of self-reliance and now devolve by a decree of the republic Supreme Soviet onto a commission—the Central Electoral Commission. This is a kind of general headquarters for the preparation, coordination and organization of the elections which await us in the next 5 years (the term of the commission's authority).

The Central Electoral Commission is headed by G.A. Blum. He is interviewed by a correspondent of SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA.

[Lapidus] Gunar Alfredovich, introduce yourself to our readers, if you will.

[Blum] I am 59 years old, a member of the CPSU and have higher education: I graduated from the Physics and Mathematics Faculty of what is now the former Latvian State Pedagogical Institute and the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute named after A. Herzen. I am married. My son is a student at a medical institute, my wife, a candidate of sciences and head of a department at Leningrad State University.

[Lapidus] And what about your career?

[Blum] For 5 years I taught in a Riga school, for 10 years I was director. Then I was head of the Leninskiy Rayon Public Education Department and of the city department. In 1977 I became deputy chairman of the rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee]. I headed the Kirovskiy Rayispolkom for 9 years.

[Lapidus] Consequently, your experience of work in soviet bodies....

[Blum] ...was at the time I transferred to my new job 21 years, 6 months and 18 days.

[Lapidus] Thank you for your precision. You will need this valuable attribute particularly now, I believe, in practice. But more about this later. Now let us into a secret as far as you can: How do people become leaders at your level? It is not, one has to assume, simply a change of chair and nameplate?

[Blum] For me appointment as chairman of the Central Electoral Commission came as a complete surprise. I never thought I would hold such a high position. I was on leave and was summoned, interviewed and offered this job. My candidacy was then examined in the Supreme Soviet Presidium and confirmed at the session.

[Lapidus] Were alternative candidacies discussed in parallel with yours?

[Blum] I know nothing about this.

[Lapidus] And how did you start your activity?

[Blum] With a thorough, article-by-article study of the new election act. For both the members of the Central Electoral Commission and myself this is the principal instrument in our day-to-day activity.

[Lapidus] Almost 2 months have elapsed since the formation of the Central Electoral Commission. How do you feel in your new position? After all, there is here a different scale of activity and different vision of this situation or the other. Is not the former—rayon—experience of work a hindrance?

[Blum] First of all, I am very palpably aware of the tremendous responsibility which has been entrusted to our commission. Its decision is final and, in the broad sense, not for discussion. But I consider the work in the rayispolkom valuable. I dealt with elections there several times and was myself a deputy. I therefore know the electoral structure from within, as it were, from an upward-looking angle.

[Lapidus] And how did you take your leave of the Kirovskiy Rayispolkom?

[Blum] A session was held which relieved me of the duties of chairman. I was given a very warm send-off. But I live in Kirovskiy Rayon, walk there every day; and even now, mechanically evidently, one takes note: this has not been completed, intervention is needed here. I am not losing my ties to the district.

[Lapidus] Please tell us how the composition of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Central Electoral Commission was determined.

[Blum] The Supreme Soviet Presidium decided this issue without my participation. Each district of the republic put forward candidates for members of the commission at its own discretion. All strata of the population proved to be represented ultimately. There are party, soviet and trade union officials, a scientist, doctor, lawyer, worker, engineers.... even two journalists.

[Lapidus] Gorkom [city party committee] and raykom [rayon party committee] secretaries, the head of the Department of the Administration of Affairs of the Council of Ministers, a senior scientific associate of the Institute of Philosophy and Law are under your authority....

[Blum] How will a former rayispolkom chairman manage senior officials of such a level, you mean to say? Obviously, none of the 39 people became a part of the commission to represent his office. Were the concerns of the commission secondary and the office primary, work in the Central Electoral Commission would have been in keeping with this. The first months have shown that this is no threat to us.

[Lapidus] So, why do we need a central electoral commission: so that there will be some place to which complaints may be addressed, as long as it is not now Moscow (we recall the spring battles) but somewhat closer to Riga?

[Blum] How so...? We are not a complaints bureau. More precisely, this is just one of many of our duties. All is clearly stipulated in Article 20 of the new election act. The article has nine clauses. It is hardly worth listing them all. I shall mention the main functions. On all the territory of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] the commission supervises the fulfillment of the Election Act and provides for its uniform application. In addition, we guide the activity of the electoral commissions, allocate monetary resources, establish the forms of all electoral documentation and so forth.

[Lapidus] The duties are clear. What about rights?

[Blum] There are sufficient rights. On all the issues within our jurisdiction the commission's decision is final. So we do not have the right to go wrong.

[Lapidus] I have no reason to doubt the competence of the members of the Central Electoral Commission. Nonetheless, who, if only theoretically, could rescind your decision?

[Blum] The republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, a session of the highest organ of power, the Latvian SSR Supreme Court and the constitutional commission, if it is formed.

[Lapidus] How many full-time officials are on the commission?

[Blum] One: Its chairman.

[Lapidus] How much will the activity of the Central Electoral Commission cost the republic?

[Blum] On the order of R300,000. This is made up of expenditure on printing the Election Act, election posters, a reserve for a second ballot....

[Lapidus] And the elections themselves?

[Blum] Some R2.5 million have been allocated to the local soviets for the preparation and holding of the elections. I want to stress particularly that the election campaign is being financed only from state resources. Any transfers and donations and all other sources are prohibited by law.

[Lapidus] A few words about what the commission has already done.

[Blum] We have held two sessions. We examined and confirmed a plan of organizational measures pertaining to the elections, estimates, various documents and electoral okrugs for servicemen. In all, some 590 rayon, city, city rayon, community and rural electoral commissions have been formed. Each has up to 10 members on average. This means 4,946 persons. Plus approximately 1,700 precinct commissions, which have an average of 12 members each. Thus, approximately 25,000 persons are directly involved in the organization and holding of the elections. It is they who are primarily responsible for observance of the Election Act.

The activity of all these commissions should be constantly kept in our field of vision.

Taking advantage of this occasion, I wish to notify all voters that 0900-1800 hours weekdays have been established as working hours in the Central Electoral Commission. Our telephone number is 32-58-57.

[Lapidus] What difficulties have you already encountered?

[Blum] It is primarily the technical support which is lacking. The Election Act has not yet been printed, for example. But how can the electoral commissions operate without it? The importance of the active participation of absolutely everyone in the upcoming elections is not understood everywhere. The assertiveness of the public is particularly low as yet in activities conducted at their places of residence. In my view, the reason is that people still do not believe in the efficacy and efficiency of the work of the local soviets.

[Lapidus] You now have an opportunity to address at one time all members of the electoral commissions of all levels.

[Blum] I want to advise them to study the Election Act thoroughly, and to work without retreating from the provisions of the act one iota. This will automatically remove any complaints. All the work of the commissions

should be performed in an atmosphere of the most extensive glasnost and by enlisting the media, radio, television and representatives of the public and the work force. Only thus can we insure ourselves against mistakes and put a stop to various rumors and inventions.

[Lapidus] And, finally, the objectiveness of the decisions of the Central Electoral Commission—on what is it based?

[Blum] On the fact that each member of the commission was recommended by a specific rayon. Consequently, the person is known and trusted. One further factor. None of us may be elected as a deputy, none has the right to participate in election agitation in any form.

Estonia's Titma on Repeal of Article 6

90UN0477A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 p 6

[Interview with Mikk Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee for ideology and professor of sociology, conducted by Yu. Rusaak, reprinted from 23 November edition of MAALEKHT: "Without Article 6"]

[Text] [Rusaak] Abrogation of Article 6 of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution would mean for the party and the whole of society essentially the same as the recent historical-legal evaluation of the events of 1940. Estonia is more than ready for this legal evaluation. But is the Estonian Communist Party ready for such constitutional changes?

[Titma] I shall begin with history. The period when this article appeared in the constitution was characterized by an endeavor to monopolize power. Article 6 essentially marked the merger of the party and the state, and the state became an agency in the hands of the party.

What is the situation today? Abrogation of Article 6 would not change the situation much. There are in Estonia movements which have taken shape within the party essentially. But this question is of tremendous political importance, and legally it would change the situation radically. Nor can Estonia be viewed in isolation from the Union here. Inasmuch as the need for the abrogation of Article 6 is maturing in the Union more slowly than in Estonia, some of the party machinery is getting the idea that it will with the aid of this article be able to preserve the party's power. But this is extremely naive, and the more persistent the adherence to this position, the more rapidly the party will lose its authority proper. Understanding this, the Estonian Communist Party leadership is moving perfectly consciously toward the abrogation of Article 6 and, obviously, toward conflicts with certain forces in the CPSU Central Committee. I am sure that this fundamental article will soon be excluded from the Estonian Constitution. Despite any momentary aspects.

[Rusaak] But could it not happen that, following abrogation of this ill-starred article, the communists would be left without a single seat in parliament, without a single portfolio in the cabinet?

[Titma] It could. But I do not believe this sufficiently realistic. More evident is the version where communists are in power in the Union as a whole, and here we have some kind of coalition. In a situation where in the Union as a whole power remains with the communists, removing the communists from power in Estonia would obviously be politically unrealistic. After all, we know that a coalition taking account of the actual correlation of forces has been formed in Hungary, for example. In Poland also the communists are members of the government.

[Rusaak] Abrogation of Article 6 would also mean that the Supreme Soviet would register extreme movements, the PNNE [Estonian National Independence Party] and the ID [Intermovement]?

[Titma] If registration begins, it would, in my view, be a matter of principle to register all movements, as in all democratic states. But even they pose the condition of their recognizing the existing order. This does not prevent the movements setting as their goals a change in order by the parliamentary path. In any case, it is better for society when all movements, extreme movements included, are registered.

[Rusaak] What would you do were you...leader of the PNNE?

[Titma] Lagle Parek, Enn Tarto and other people who fought for Estonia's independence when this meant imprisonment constitute the nucleus of this party. These are strong people, convinced of their ideas. I, for example, have known Tunne Kelam a long time and I know that he is no extremist who might avail himself of undemocratic means, having obtained power. Of course, there are in the PNNE people who, upon coming to power, would begin represssive measures. But there are few such, fortunately.

What would I do were I leader of the PNNE... I believe that in the present situation they are behaving quite moderately, particularly considering the goals which they have set themselves. In carrying through the demarche of citizens' committees they attempted to thereby acquire political authority, and have done so. Their goal—accomplishing changes in Estonian society via the political mechanism—is accepted by some Estonians also.

It would be another matter were the PNNE to become a mass movement and acquire power and, accordingly, responsibility for actual policy, for the fate of the Estonian people. What would I do in this case...

The principal distinguishing feature of a mature politician is always being able to see the multi-variant nature of the future and to preserve the possibility of acting in

all probable versions. The Estonian people must survive under any, even the blackest, scenarios of events. Such would be leader's credo were I in the PNNE.

[Rusaak] And if you were leader of the ID?

[Titma] This question is more difficult. The aim of this movement is destructive: halting Estonians' movement toward independence. Compromise may be reached with the Intermovement on all other issues. But not on this one. After all, the Intermovement essentially identifies with the positions of a great-power Union in its past form. In terms of their platform they are the representatives of outside forces in Estonia, and behave as such. They cannot accomplish a turnabout and be the representatives of non-Estonians in Estonia. Here is a fundamental difference between the ID and non-Estonians in Estonia, many of whom are thinking about how Estonia should develop and how to reach consensus with Estonians to move forward together. We need from these people's standpoint to pose the question of their merger with the rest of Estonian society and of the common future of Estonians and non-Estonians in an independent Estonia. The aim of the ID is great-power expansion in this society. This means that their struggle is built on an ideology according to which a large people achieves its power at the expense of other peoples, and not on an ideology of inner power and the improvement and development of culture, science and technology. As Gorbachev formulated the goal of perestroyka.

Were I leader of the ID, I would ask myself: Is a strong Russia, a strong Union possible in the previous form, that is, on condition of the suppression of the outlying areas. And my answer to this cardinal question would be clearly negative. After all, what would happen to the Union and perestroyka were all the outlying areas to resist? Consequently, we need to think about how we can get the Russians who live among other peoples to ponder their future in a perspective of several generations, be this future if only in the form of a common European home. But, unfortunately, such a way of thinking is alien to the ID leaders living great-power dreams.

[Rusaak] We all know that there are many communists among the ID leaders. But one party cannot unite people of the most extreme views. The Estonian Communist Party Congress lies ahead. Will this mean a split in the party?

[Titma] It is no secret that many communists, Estonians particularly, are saying that we need to act as in Hungary: first an ideological purge, then a renaming of the party. This is understandable. But before making a cardinal ruling affecting the whole people, we need to think through even the blackest scenarios. Let us examine one of them. Many foreign observers, whose opinions I share, are maintaining that this winter will be decisive for the Union. Perestroyka and Gorbachev will win or... This opinion is based on a simple deduction: The economic state of the Union is catastrophic. It will be difficult in winter providing all people with produce, commodities and fuel. Social unrest could occur in many regions. The way out of this situation—imposition in the Union of a state of emergency. I mean by state of emergency by no means martial law but, for example, suspension of the activity of the Supreme Soviet and the action of certain articles of the constitution. In any event, the Estonian people must reckon with this possibility. The communists particularly. I therefore believe that the wisest thing would be to postpone the congress until a later date, when the crisis is more apparent. I believe that February will be that very time. Then the question of the party could be tackled strategically, and not under the influence of circumstances of the moment.

[Rusaak] There are in the party currently democrats, nationalists, social democrats, socialists, Eurocommunists and communists with views of the 1950's. Into what factions will the party split and who will be in the majority?

[Titma] I believe that from the viewpoint of Estonia's future this is not the most important question. Today's communists in Estonia are not such narrow-minded persons as people sometimes attempt to portray them. I believe that different parties will be able to create a coalition in the name of Estonia's interests. The main question lies elsewhere. I believe that abrogation of Article 6 and the creation of a multiparty system will come to our assistance. Obviously, the Russians in Estonia will form their party also. After all, we cannot today speak of representation of the true interests of the community in any one movement. Pressure on non-Estonians in Estonia on the part of the ID is currently very strong. But the actual political process indicates that the non-Estonians who have taken root here will not follow the ID.

[Rusaak] You recently visited the United States. What is the attitude there toward the Baltic question?

[Titma] The evaluation of the events of the 1940's was undoubtedly the most radical step taken by the Supreme Soviet thus far. Why were there no foreign journalists here, why was there no commentary on this in the leading papers, as was the case previously, when we took tiny steps? It is in this light that I answer the question. America is concerned for tranquillity, Europe, for security. Gorbachev has made an unprecedented contribution to the preservation of world peace. And a step which destabilizes his position is condemned in the eyes of the world community. For example, strong pressure is currently being exerted on Bush that he grant the USSR most-favored-nation status in trade and the possibility of credit for the purchase of commodities to satisfy the miners' demands. Were we to declare our withdrawal from the Union, this would be a blow to Gorbachev, and the world community would not understand us, as it failed to fully understand the historical-legal assessment of the events of 1940. An information blockade was erected.

[Rusaak] We are speaking about abrogation of Article 6, but even today the Estonian Communist Party remains the leading force of society. But what today is problem number 1 for the party leaders?

[Titma] I do not believe that the strikes will be repeated in the immediate future. Strikers are not encountering support in Moscow now. On account of our economic situation. A blacker scenario is now being, rather, has already been plugged in: the United Workforce Council and the ID are demanding the creation of autonomous okrugs for the Russian-speaking population. What does this mean in essence? People have been coming here for the past 50 years. This was the case in the 1940's and 1950's. It was a process directed from the center for the sake of the creation of a loyal population. Subsequently the process was furthered with the aid of economic levers. But rights to national territory do not take shape in the lifetime of a single generation. Such a process is essentially colonization. International documents interpret such unequivocally. The latter-day Estonians were not summoned here, departments sent them here. None of these people specifically is to blame, each must be guaranteed human rights. In connection with the citizens' committees movement non-Estonians have gained the impresssion that there is a desire to deprive them of their rights, beginning with jobs, pensions and so forth. A democratic society secures rights for all its members, not to mention local inhabitants. If, however, these people start to demand autonomy, this will mean that they desire the consolidation and official recognition of colonization. We need to struggle against this from the standpoints of human rights and the articles of all international legal documents. So we face extremely serious negotiations in the CPSU Central Committee. I am sure that, given such extremism, extreme nationalist activity would be stimulated right away. The situation could be explosive. And this we must avoid.

Estonian Democratic Labor Party Profiled

90UN0302A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 27 Oct 89 p 3

[Interview with Paul Lepp, deputy chairman of the Estonian Democratic Labor Party, by V. Akimov: "'Democratic Socialism Is the Distant Future'"]

[Text] **In offering for the attention of the readers of SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA regular material making it possible to form an idea of the political forces operating in the republic, the editorial office reserves the right not to share the viewpoints expounded in the interviews.**

[Lepp] We need to move toward it gradually, step by step. The history of the building of socialism in the Soviet Union persuades us that the laws of social development cannot be cheated or ignored. Leaping social and economic formations through which all mankind has passed is impossible. The attempt to embark on socialism directly from feudalism ended in failure. Capitalism may be criticized, weak points may be found therein. But the positive experience of the organization of the economy and the social sphere which has been accumulated in this society in the two centuries of its existence cannot be forgotten. So, I may be asked, shall we now start to build capitalism? No. We need to begin to build a new society from the point we are at today. The Estonian Democratic Labor Party—a social democratic organization and analogue of the Labor Party in Great Britain, for example—sets itself the task of contributing to the building of a society of social justice. In our program we call it democratic socialism. I would note, incidentally, that the same term "democratic socialism" appeared also in recent documents of the first Congress of Soviets of the USSR. It is not as yet clear, it is true, how it is understood by the people's deputies. As we, on the other hand, see it, it would not in this society be necessary to struggle for social justice, and man would be free of worries about his daily bread, a roof over his head and the search for earnings.

But the social democratic society which has been built in Sweden seems to me too left. In this country everyone—both the person who works conscientiously and the idler—have the right equally to hopes of obtaining a living wage. Our party is a labor party. Consequently, only the person who labors, performing any job, may lay claim to a good, sufficient life, in our opinion. It is precisely by the results of labor that he is recognized by society. It is of no significance what kind of work a man performs. He may be a journalist or lathe hand, cybernetic engineer or construction worker, it is not important. The main thing is that his labor be necessary to society.

But there are in each society certain categories of people which for various reasons cannot work productively—invalids, young people, children, old persons. They primarily should be provided with the minimum necessary to live on and without any prior conditions. The degree of maturity and humanity of any society may be judged only by one characteristic—its attitude toward these categories of people. I have a telling personal reason for being a social democrat. My father was an invalid, and I saw plenty of the sufferings of a man who had lost his legs. My father sought for many years to obtain a well-appointed apartment. He could not in his wheelchair get down our stairs to the street. Had he not had sons who carried him out into the street manually and helped him surmount many dozens of bureaucratic barriers, his situation might have been even worse than that of many thousands of such invalids in our country. So for me the building of a genuinely democratic society, at the center of which is not an abstract idea but man, the individual, is of profound personal meaning.

[Akimov] The ideas of social democracy are very popular in the world. Certain Communist parties also are turning to this experience today. To judge by certain publications, social democratic circles and clubs are appearing in a number of regions of our country, too.

[Lepp] We have close ties to many such movements which have arisen in various parts of the Soviet Union.

There are more than 90 of them. We feel the need to commune and exchange thoughts and ideas. There is a decision in principle on the formation of a social democratic association. This congress is to take place in Tallinn in the first half of next January.

Essentially we know little about social democracy. We in our country lack serious studies on this score, and the publications which exist are, as a rule, one-sided and prejudiced. Yet a very important social democratic movement existed in Russia at one time. A paradox of history is that the Communist Party, having as its predecessor a social democratic party, was for many decades hostile toward its maternal foundation, it may be said. Stalin bluntly called the European social democrats social fascists, which did not add to his fame, of course, but thoroughly undermined the unity of forces of the left in prewar Europe.

The Estonian Democratic Labor Party still does not have many members today. Up to the present year, not being officially registered, we deemed it unethical to conduct propaganda of our ideas and to increase our ranks.

[Akimov] How do you intend organizing your work under the present, specific conditions?

[Lepp] We make no secret of the fact that our aim is the building of an independent Estonian state. But I absolutely cannot agree with those who see the new state as the rightful successor of the Estonian Republic of the 1920's-1940's and maintain that the Estonian people defined their position 70 years ago. Their opinion is correct from the legal viewpoint. But we are now living in an entirely different society, in a different world, and view the situation in a new manner. Under these conditions we cannot delegate our present rights to our forefathers. If I today wish to be independent, I myself have today to decide what life is henceforward to be like. This is one fundamentally important position. Another is that in speaking of self-determination we proceed primarily from concepts of utility and expediency. Any alliance is concluded only if the unifying parties see some benefit in it. In the half-century of Estonia's incorporation in the Union no one has yet been able to show that this alliance has been useful to our people, and we have not as yet been able to comprehend its benefit. Consequently, a principal direction in policy for us now is contributing to the achievement of Estonia's independence. We can do this only by the democratic, parliamentary path, participating in the elaboration and adoption of current laws.

Another important direction in political life for us is participation in the creation of a real multiparty political structure of society. Only under multiparty conditions is a search possible, I believe, for optimum development paths. After all, it cannot be the case in real life that only one political party is right, and all the others wrong. We make no assessment of any other parties in our program. We are for a multiplicity of opinions. In foisting on man some one viewpoint and compelling conclusions drawn by one party to be taken as truth in the last instance we would hereby be limiting freedom of choice and driving it into another cage. Were we to say that we were against the existence of the Communist Party, we also would, consequently, be adopting dictatorial positions. All political forces should have equal opportunities for influencing people's minds and hearts. Whoever is able to convince people of his rightness leads society. Prohibition, repression—there can be none of this in a democratic society. There should exist among the parties competition confined merely to one framework—that of political culture.

However, we consider the most important business for ourselves at the present stage participation in realization of the IME [Estonian self-management] economic program. Although there is not as yet a whole package of laws regulating the life of a financially autonomous Estonia, it seems to us that this program could serve as a sound basis for work. What do we find attractive in it? Primarily the absence of a vast army of intermediary-distributers between man and production and the fact that there would be over the enterprises no departments interfering in their affairs. It is clear even now that the government, the State Planning Committee and other forces are failing to cope with a principal task of the moment—explanation to people of the need for and purpose of the ongoing changes. We will try as far as possible to fill this gap. There is another point here also. It is clear that no rise in the living standard is to be expected in the first years of the reform. Consequently, it is necessary to take pains to ensure that the changes occur as painlessly as possible. Particularly for the needy strata of the population. The state must in this period concern itself precisely with those who receive small pensions and grants and invalids, old people and the youth. We cannot count on others' dollars. I myself am no financial expert but I understand full well in what debts could result for the people. We need self-reliance primarily.

[Akimov] How do you evaluate the progress of the present election campaign and how democratic, in your opinion, are the elections to the local self-management authorities?

[Lepp] It seems to me that the election act in force currently is too democratic for us. It runs somewhat ahead of the political situation which exists in society and is geared more toward a multiparty system. Whoever maintains that we are close to the creation of a multiparty system is engaging in wishful thinking. It is not, after all, a matter of how many parties or movements have been recognized and are operating officially. There may be many political parties. But this by no means signifies a multiparty system. The functioning of this system becomes possible only when a law determining the procedure of the formation of elective organs of power based on mandates obtained by the parties and movements at the elections has been enacted. Win so many seats, and you obtain the corresponding number of places in parliament or the local self-management

authorities. Some other solution of the problems will lend nothing to the development of democracy.

We are going into the present elections in a bloc with the People's Front. And this is natural because we grew out of the People's Front. How we will operate subsequently, practice and the development of the political situation will tell.

Ukraine Adopts Decision on Chernobyl Amelioration

LD2012112389 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] We still continue to harvest the fruits of our criminal indifference, forgetting that behind it there stand people, their life, and health.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers and the Trade Union Council have adopted a decision on additional health measures and material assistance to the population living on the territory affected by radioactive pollution as a result of the Chernobyl breakdown.

All efforts should be concentrated on carrying out measures connected with the evacuation of inhabitants of certain populated localities, proceeding from the medical indicators and taking social factors into account. The building of specialized curative establishments and youth centers is planned.

The decision also envisions the introduction of additional payments to increase wages, to finance longer maternity and annual leave, and to assist insufficiently provided families.

Of course, all of this is badly needed, and even in greater quantities. But it would be much better if we did not allow such crimes to happen and if the social and economic situation in the republic was more stable.

Patriarch Appeals to Gorbachev Over Atrocities

LD2112231289 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] The head of the Russian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Pimen, has urged Mikhail Gorbachev, the United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar and Pope John Paul II to immediately do their utmost to stop the illegal actions of Greco-Catholics in the Western Ukraine. He informed about the seizure of a cathedral in Ivano-Frankovsk on Wednesday and several other Russian Orthodox churches in the area earlier. Today the cathedral was freed from attackers by believers, but atrocities continue in other places with the support of the Committee for the Defense of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Popular Movement for Perestroyka. Archbishop Makariy of Ivano-Frankovsk has declared a hunger strike of protest. Messages have also been sent to the current Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow.

Archbishop on Uniates' Attempt to Seize Cathedral

LD2112171189 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] Kiev December 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Roman Fabrika:

A large number of Eastern Catholics—Uniates—together with representatives of the Committee for the Protection of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, attempted on Wednesday to seize the Resurrection Cathedral in Ivano-Frankovsk, the Ukraine. They were joined by a members of a number of local informal organisations.

The cathedral belongs to the Orthodox community and was recently refurbished with the funds provided by believers, the diocese and the savings of Archbishop Makari of Ivano-Frankovsk and Kolomyya.

Crowds of incensed people, mostly nonlocal women, were shouting insults and threatening the archbishop, who was conducting a liturgy.

Surrounding the cathedral they actually took the archbishop hostage. In protest the clergyman announced that he was beginning a fast.

"I am for legality, not for violence," the archbishop told TASS. "The seizures of churches, which have become more frequent in the Western Ukraine recently, sow animosity among believers. If such events are not stopped, they may lead to fratricide. Orthodox clergymen in the west of the Ukraine demand immediate intercession and protection."

Archbishop Makari said that hostile acts and violence do not befit Christians. They are a disgrace to the Catholic Church and undermine the prestige of Pope John Paul the second, who is held in high esteem by Orthodox Christians in the Ukraine and Russia.

The orthodox Church has no wish for events similar to those in Northern Ireland to take place in the Western Ukraine, Archbishop Makari said.

"All these questions and disputes should be settled constitutionally, on the basis of legality," the archbishop said.

"The violation of the rights of believers of one or another confession should not be tolerated. Animosity and extremism should not be stirred up. I call for prayer, for mutual understanding between Catholics and Orthodox Christians," the archbishop said.

Belorussian Party Leader Addresses Youth

90UN0299C Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 p 1

[Report on speech by Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, at 3 November youth conference in Minsk]

[Text] It is as if, meeting with you, that I have returned to my own youth. Things were different for people of my generation who experienced the burdens of war and the restoration of the economy. And at the same time, the same as for you, with the freshness of disposition, thirst for what is new and daring, and the striving to give to the beloved fatherland the effort, energy, and intellect characteristic of youth.

I liked many of the speeches from this podium for their analytical approach to the search for ways of solving problems, the pointedness of the formulation of questions, and their constructive nature.

Your proposals will help us—I mean the leadership of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the BSSR [Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers—to approach comprehensively and in greater depth the solution of youth's problems in general and students' problems in particular.

You are obviously hoping that I will provide answers in my speech to all the questions of interest to you. But you will agree that this is practically impossible. For this reason I shall dwell, and briefly at that, on what is most important.

As I know, the following questions have been asked from time to time recently in the press, on television, and in student halls: In what kind of society are we living, by what path should we proceed further?

Assertions have appeared even to the effect that the October Revolution was a mistake, that "barracks socialism" and Stalin's regime and tyranny were creations of the socialist system itself, and that the "salvation" of our society lies in a departure from socialist values and its restructuring in virtually a capitalist key.

I wish to say to you with all certainty: The Communist Party will never renounce the socialist choice and creative Marxism-Leninism. That socialism has been deformed and distorted is another matter.

Perestroyka has confronted all of us with the task of imparting a new quality to socialism on the basis of profound transformations and overcoming man's alienation from the results of labor, from the means of production, and from power via democratization and glasnost, via a reforming of property relations and the political structure of society, and via a recuperation of the spiritual and moral spheres.

How are these processes developing in our republic?

The social and political situation which has taken shape with us makes it possible, on the whole, to purposefully perform work on fulfillment of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the First Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, and the 30th Belorussian Communist Party Congress. Each inhabitant of the republic has an opportunity to go about his business—to work, study, create, and recreate.

Some people do not like this. From time to time absurd rumors and a variety of fables are spread about Soviet Belorussia. You will, of course, have heard the expression "surviving Stalinist republic." Let us take a look together at what kind of "surviving republic" this is and how it appears among our union sisters.

Data was published recently on the USSR's socioeconomic development in the 9 months of 1989, which has been difficult in all respects. We have no need to be ashamed of our standing among the union republics.

In industry, production grew 4.7% (2.2% in the country) and productivity, 5% (3.6% in the country). It needs to be considered here that it is often necessary to work on the run, as they say, experiencing a shortage of components, raw material, and intermediate products.

Some 32 quintals of grain per hectare were harvested. The cereals' yield was higher only in the Ukraine and Moldavia, and that thanks to corn. The potato, sugar beet, and fodder crop harvest was reasonably good also.

The following facts, inter alia, point to a strengthening of the social focus of the development of the economy: The introduction of housing increased 8%, and R590 million of consumer goods were manufactured, and R90 million of services were rendered over and above the plan.

And one further piece of evidence, from a detached observer, as they say. In this September's issue the very well-known journal THE ECONOMIST, which is published in the United States, analyzed the development of the USSR's economy and concluded: Belorussia is securing the country's highest average annual rate of growth of per capita of national income—4.5%; Lithuania, 4.4%; the Ukraine, 3.4%; Estonia, 2.4%; Moldavia, 2.7%; the Russian Federation, 2.6% (p 32).

I do not wish you to understand me to be saying that there are no problems in the republic. There are, and many. In the development of the economy and culture, in the social sphere, in the assimilation of new forms and methods of management, and in the strengthening of law and order, discipline, and organization.

Our weakest link, sorest point, I would say, is the imbalance on the consumer market. The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and BSSR Council of Ministers are persistently seeking ways to stabilize it. It has been necessary to resort also to such a measure—unpopular, but essential as of the present—as the imposition of the quota allocation of the commodities in the shortest supply.

This is a forced and temporary measure. And we will abandon it at the first opportunity. And this will, I am sure, come in the very near future since all plants and associations, of group "A" included, are persistently building up the manufacture of consumer goods, the process of defense sector conversion is gaining momentum, and joint ventures with overseas firms are being set up.

Large-scale comprehensive programs in respect of all the most important fields—from the modernization of mechanical engineering through the revival and development of national culture and an improvement in the environment—are being drawn up and implemented.

All this will undoubtedly produce positive results. But the unity of all public forces in the main directions of development is required for their achievement.

It has, however, to be seen that together with those endeavoring to accelerate the creative processes there are persons in the republic who wish to cause destabilization in the economy and chaos in society. With demagogy, political intrigue, and speculation on temporary economic difficulties they are attempting to take part of the population and the youth with them.

It does not suit them that the situation in the republic is businesslike, in the main. The course of their reasoning is primitive. The republic is fulfilling the plans? Rubbish, these are imaginary achievements having nothing in common with perestroyka. They need to be judged by other criteria. Which precisely? Having become a separatist and not respecting people of a different nationality means having restructured. And if you sling mud at the party and the executive cadres and censure all that has been achieved by the people in the years of Soviet power, you will unfailingly be put in the category of the true supporters of perestroyka.

The substitution of concepts and criteria works like this: It is not the person who works honestly and conscientiously, strengthens discipline and organization, and feels personally responsible for what is happening in the collective, the republic, and the country who is a champion of perestroyka, but the one who substitutes psuedo-revolutionary slogans and statements for work, and attempts to impair the working collective and introduce a lack of organization and sloppiness therein.

Why are they doing this? In order to come to power on this wave and turn the republic aside from the socialist path and introduce private ownership, hired labor, and man's exploitation of man. In other words, to bring back his majesty the gentleman master.

This is why all that has been achieved by our people is being painted by them only in black. But the working people can see who's who. They will not allow either themselves or all that has been done by hand and mind to be disposed of, and will rebuff all extremist forces under whatever colors they appear.

The biography of the republic and the life of your grandfathers, fathers, and mothers, still young at that time, has contained everything—the joy of victories, the sorrow of mistakes, and totally unjustified losses. But this is not simply history—it is our history. Can we forget the young men and women who left student halls as volunteers for the front and who perished in fascist torture chambers and gave their last strength at the lathe and in the field to ensure that there be bread, meat, and shells for the front, for the victory.

If this is not remembered, we will have no renewal, no upsurge of national culture, no national concord.

I recently received a letter from T. Bildeyko, a member of the CPSU since 1943. This is what he writes: "Our young people born since the Great Patriotic War do not know what Soviet Belorussia was like in the 1930's, following its liberation from the German-fascist aggressors. But they need to know in order to get their bearings correctly in the political situation and appreciate what has been done by the older generation."

The intention of those who portray our history as a chain of mistakes is obvious: striking at the party as painfully as possible. But it is clear to any person of common sense that there have been and are no more consistent fighters for the people's interests than the communists, and Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] members have always marched and are now marching alongside them.

Testimony to this also is the history of the Belorussian Communist Party, whose best sons and daughters gave their lives defending the people's happiness and our freedom and independence. It was hit primarily by Stalin's repression. Few of you know, evidently, that of the 101 Belorussian Communist Party city party committees and rayon party committees, 99 were subjected to repression in 1937-1940 alone. Some 110 leading Komsomol officials were subjected to repressive measures also. So can responsibility for all that is negative be heaped on a party which together with the people created Soviet power, together with the people defended it, and together with the people is persistently seeking ways of improving life?

Of course, the republic party organization has made mistakes and has unfinished work to do. But there have been no Rashidov's, Medunov's, and Churbanov's among us.

We can and should be proud of N.S. Patolichev, S.O. Prityts'kiy, K.T. Mazurov, V.I. Kozlov, P.M. Masherov, T.Ya. Kiselev, F.A. Surganov, V.Ye. Lobanok, I.Ye. Polyakov, and A.N. Aksensov. This confirms once again that questions of the selection, assignment, and education of cadres have always been at the center of attention of the whole Belorussian Communist Party. And if some people have taken this undue liberty or the other and perpetrated this abuse or the other, they have been treated by their party comrades and the work force as they deserve. And we will continue to adhere to this line just as firmly and strictly.

Those who, in spite of everything, are attempting to discredit the party have a single aim—embroiling it with the people. For this reason it is important for all of us to display wisdom and responsibility and not succumb to demagogic statements and various inventions.

What would society gain by having swept the party, let us assume, from the political scene? Would all economic, social, and national problems be solved? Would we not have a thousand times more complex a situation? Would we not have to bring to mind the regularity observed long ago: "What we have, we do not keep, having lost it, we weep for it"?

And the statements which are heard from time to time concerning the introduction of a multiparty system? Do we not know countries where there are as many parties as one could wish for, but where a dictatorial form of the administration of society and scandalous social inequality are preserved here?

It is not a question of a one- or two-party system, but of to whom power belongs. The purpose of political reform consists of reviving the sovereignty of the soviets, to which the people democratically send their best sons and daughters.

In the formation of renewed, efficient soviets we are counting seriously on the Komsomol and the youth, students included. As you know, educational institution collectives have obtained the right to nominate their representatives as candidates for people's deputy.

We are for a restoration of the Leninist principles of party life, a restoration of the Leninist principles of the life of the Komsomol. Those who are encroaching on the Komsomol are pursuing a far-reaching aim—depriving the country of ideologically convinced cadres devoted to the cause of socialism.

Addressing you from this platform, I would ask that you pursue the line: a Leninist Komsomol with a Leninist party.

In other words, we regard the Komsomol as an independent social and political youth organization standing on a common political platform with the party.

And I have to firmly state that all attempts to split the party and the Komsomol and isolate the young people from the party are futile. The party supports the creation of an effective state youth policy and large-scale investments in the solution of youth problems. It cannot be otherwise for these are investments in our future.

It would make sense having youth affairs commissions in the soviets of all levels and a corresponding committee in the republic government. Only your legislative initiative is needed. The republic Komsomol has this right, and it should make active and skillful use of it.

We support the politicization of the youth, the young men and women being clearly aware of their interests, both today's and long-term interests, what is more, matching them up without prejudice against and correlating them with the aspirations of the people, the party, and the state and finding their place in the creative development of the socialist society.

Ultimately the politicization of the youth seems to us a process whose basis is a moral orientation toward unity of thought and deed and responsibility.

You may argue with me, but if these priorities are not observed in the life of youth groups and at the time of formation of the personality, it is evidently useless speaking of political assertiveness at large.

We are all faced primarily with the task of revitalizing creative thought and building up our intellectual muscles. We need to rid ourselves of the Oblomovism here, pedantic dogmatism, and dogmatic pedantry. It is important that the youth formulate a clear philosophical, creative position on the basis of in-depth knowledge, all-around comprehension of the political and moral experience of mankind, and cognition of the searchings and strivings of its best minds, and also an appreciation of the entire palette of views and slogans of the present day. I am convinced that if this quest of young thought is completely honest, objective, and balanced, the choice will unfailingly be in favor of the socialist ideal and socialist values.

I emphasize objective, because it is important in the process thereof also to correctly evaluate the preachings of the enemies of our people and incantations of political opportunists and to resolutely oppose extremist forces.

We are for any dialogue, we are for the keenest debate and discussion if they help us find a constructive path toward real work, toward creation. But we are against those mass meetings whose basis is the inertia of a permanent talking-shop and an endeavor to disunite people and push them toward mutual bitterness.

Please understand that it is not simply dangerous but extraordinarily dangerous when children, adolescents, and the elderly are pulled into these meetings. In addition, they are used like an unthinking crowd—and it is precisely crowd that they are called by the extremists—for the purpose of challenging the local authorities and creating the appearance of large numbers.

As the father of two children, I understand how difficult it is for a young person to grasp the complex situation of our time and guard against mistakes and wrong steps. But let us be completely honest and look truth in the eye dispassionately.

Tell me, which opponent of the Belorussian Communist Party has today offered constructive, innovative ideas? None. On the contrary, they are most shamelessly putting our ideas and proposals to their own political use. And which of these demagogues has been the organizer of a useful undertaking? Again, no one; they are attaching themselves to our affairs, to our programs, to our results.

And let not this loud shouting, which is presented as a model of bold eloquence, the burgeoning of a pluralism of opinions and the discovery of a long-awaited truth—let this shouting not lead you astray.

Believe me, if the accomplishment of all the problems confronting the republic amounted merely to the realization of individual shouts of the "down with this leadership or the other" type, I am sure that this question would be solved in a matter of days. But you understand full well that everything is considerably more complex. For this reason it has not entered the heads of leaders and honest communists to give way to those who are attempting behind the backs of the people of Soviet Belorussia to encroach on socialist values and on Soviet power.

I and my Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee comrades believe in the civic maturity of the republic's youth and that it will not allow itself to be carried away by fraudulent slogans and that extremism and calls of a nationalist, antisocialist nature will, however they are disguised, be identified and fittingly rebuffed.

We believe that our young men and women will not retreat from the ideas of October and that they see socialist creation as their responsibility for the future of the country and Soviet Belorussia.

You will agree with me that the political, economic, and educational reforms, the republic's transition to the principles of self-management and self-financing and national-cultural processes—in none of these and other most important areas of perestroyka is success possible without the participation of the youth and without the high professionalism of the working man.

Let us ponder why the work force is, as before, critical of the professional training of young specialists. Why does their acclimatization to the shop floor take years? Why are many degree-holders unable to "find" themselves?

The answer here is not only the standard of teaching and the presentation of research work in the VUZ [higher educational institution], but also the lack of the personality's tendency toward creativity and self-expression. We see serious problems in both areas.

I shall not be disclosing a great truth if I say that a high-class specialist can only be cultivated in real, vital work requiring constant creative search. Everyone knows this condition, but far from everyone implements it.

For example, what is happening with the development of an independent financially autonomous system of the youth's S&T creativity? The average age of the members of such collectives is 36. Why are there few students in them? Perhaps there is no opportunity for their self-realization as creative personalities here? Perhaps the students have no ideas?

I believe that the answers to these questions must be found by the students themselves, the Komsomol committees, and the VUZ self-management authorities. And not only found but also persistently implemented. Otherwise our talk about high professionalism and S&T progress and our solutions concerning reform of the higher and secondary specialized school will remain merely a paper historical monument.

It is very important for society what kind of moral and ethical values and political culture are assimilated by the student and trainee youth. Many problems have emerged here also recently.

As a whole, we have every reason to be proud of our young people. However, I cannot conceal the fact that we are seriously concerned by the state of the civicism, behavorial standards, and spirituality of part of the youth, the students included.

It is very important in the VUZ's, secondary technical schools, and vocational-technical schools today to combine tuition and the accumulation of knowledge with the schooling of the personality. I could cite as many examples as you like of this dual process being severed. The result is that it is frequently not a specialist and not a personality which comes into industry.

I believe that teachers and students should constantly address the moral values and reference points which have traditionally been characteristic of the progressive intelligentsia such as respectfulness, nobility, charity, tolerance, a high standard of intercourse and service of the truth, good, and beauty. Becoming a real citizen is impossible without a build-up of the cultural stratum of the consciousness and without a constant appeal to the world of the beautiful.

Lively interest has been evoked among the students and trainees, at your conference included, by problems of social development, perestroyka, and the updating of Marxist-Leninist education. Only a constant thirst for philosophical questions and a daily appeal to the invigorating source of Marxism-Leninism will help you determine the correct social reference points and become real fighters for Leninist ideals.

It is necessary for this to alter our approaches to the study of social disciplines and abandon intellectual dependency, which has taken shape over many years, where most important theoretical truths have been assimilated in ready-made, predigested form and have failed to stimulate the students to independent thinking.

We are gratified that in the maelstrom of turbulent events and processes brought about by perestroyka there is growing interest among the young people, the students primarily, in the revival and development of our people's historical and cultural heritage.

Of course, this is a complex matter requiring great efforts based on strong philosophical and aesthetic positions.

It is important to comprehend the cultural values of the past objectively, emphatically reject that which is incidental and has contaminated and devastated people's spiritual life, and revive that which has clearly and

convincingly revealed the best customs and traditions of the people and elevated their moral and cultural potential.

We are counting on the alumni of the republic's educational institutions finding their place in the elaboration and realization in accordance with the decisions of the Belorussian Communist Party's 10th Central Committee Plenum of the comprehensive "Spadchyna" program, whose purpose is imparting a nationwide nature to the revival and development of the historical and cultural heritage.

A wide field of activity for our students is participation in implementation of the scheduled measures pertaining to expansion of the use of Belorussian.

The BSSR Supreme Soviet commission will shortly have completed the elaboration of a draft languages act. But we may say today even that its main purpose is providing not only for the all-around development and functioning of Belorussian in all spheres of our social life, but also the extensive use of Russian as the language of interethnic communication and the languages of the other nationalities living on republic territory.

You know that a great deal of preparatory work is being performed in the republic in this field. It is important to prevent both dilatoriness and haste here. We need to do everything to prevent the infringement of the interests of people of any nationality.

I would like to express my viewpoint also on the organization of the work of the student construction detachments. It is hard to exaggerate their contribution to the installation of industrial and social facilities and agricultural work. However, there are circumstances requiring, in our view, considerable restructuring in the construction detachment movement.

First, as of next year the republic will switch to the principles of self-management and self-financing. In this connection there will be an appreciable increase in its independence and responsibility for the accomplishment of economic and social tasks.

Second, we are counting on the more active participation of the students in the elimination on republic territory of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [Nuclear Electric Power Station].

The BSSR Supreme Soviet has adopted a comprehensive program on this problem and forwarded it for confirmation by the USSR Supreme Soviet in order that it assume law status.

The recent Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee plenum defined elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES as a program assignment of the republic party organization.

I believe that active participation in the realization of this program would be an important and noble undertaking for the republic Komsomol and our students. I refer to the establishment of new communities for the resettlement of residents of the afflicted areas, reinforcement of the detachment of teachers, physicians, agricultural specialists, and culture, trade, and service workers, the development and production of special equipment and instruments, participation in radiation monitoring of the environment....

In a word, useful work will be found for the students and graduates of any VUZ. And I would like to believe that there will be none among them who remain uninvolved.

Reinforcement of the physical plant of their VUZ's and technical schools should also be a sphere of the student collectives' constant attention. We have to agree with the comrades who have spoken here who rightly called it extremely neglected.

The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and republic government have approved a program for surmounting the lag therein. Without going into details, I will say only that in the next two 5-year plans it will be necessary to build as much educational space as we have currently.

Not only learning laboratories but also hostels, dining halls, and other social amenities will be increased to the standard level of higher and secondary specialized educational institution provision.

It stands to reason that this task cannot be accomplished by the powers of the construction workers alone.

Comrades! Your conference is being held at a festive time for the republic and the whole country. It is at this time that we will celebrate the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 50th anniversary of the reunification in a single fraternal family of the peoples of Western Belorussia and of the BSSR in the USSR.

I cordially congratulate you on these grand holidays.

I wish you and, through you, all the alumni of the educational institutions of Soviet Belorussia success in the assimilation of firm knowledge and the acquisition of the lofty political and moral attributes of future highly skilled specialists, worthy successors of the country's progressive intelligentsia, and active devotees of and participants in perestroyka.

The conferees adopted the decision to hold such forums annually and confirmed the quotas of the representation thereat of the student collectives.

Comrades N.I. Dementey, M.V. Kovalev, and V.I. Goncharik took part in the conference.

Armenian SSR Procurator on NKAO Legal Status

90US0174A Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 21 Oct 89 p 2

[Report on interview with Procurator of the Armenian SSR, Doctor of Legal Sciences Vladimir Rubenovich

Nazaryan, by special correspondents of KOMMUNIST and KHORURDAIN AYASTAN: "Believing in a Just Solution"; date and place not specified]

[Text] **The complex sociopolitical situation which has emerged in recent months in the republic, the prospects for overcoming it, as well as the evaluation of the Constitutional Law "On the Sovereignty of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic" adopted by the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet—this was the scope of urgent issues concerning which special correspondents of the newspapers KOMMUNIST and KHORURDAIN AYASTAN had a conversation recently with the procurator of the Armenian SSR, Doctor of Legal Sciences Vladimir Rubenovich Nazaryan. We bring it to the attention of our readers.**

[Question] Vladimir Rubenovich, we would be interested to know your evaluation of the Law on Sovereignty recently adopted by the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

[Nazaryan] This law shows the evolution of thinking of the opponents of a just solution to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. This document is qualitatively different from the previous ones which pursued the same goal. An attempt has been made through its quite flexibly worded legal provisions to bury once and for all the right of nations to self-determination by countering it with the right of free determination of the people of the Azerbaijan SSR. Only professional analysis reveals the antilegal essence of this law. Let us begin with the right of a nation to self-determination. It is pointed out in the preamble, in the very first lines, that this law is being adopted "proceeding from the right of **every nation to self-determination.**" However, several lines below, this right turns into the inalienable right "of the people of the Azerbaijan SSR to the free and independent determination of their fate." It is interesting that according to the preamble the law was adopted "acknowledging the urgent need to free the union relationships **from various distortions which have emerged as a result of retreating from Lenin's concept of the Soviet Union state.**" It is absolutely obvious that this thesis needs to be explained: which specific distortions of Lenin's policy are meant. Indeed, there have been real distortions, and right there in the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast]. It would have been easy for the Azerbajani lawmakers to become convinced of that by reading the ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Nagorno-Karabakh. However, reading apparently was not in their interest....

Several lines below, another reason for adopting this law is also pointed out. It is the need "to bring the legislation of the Azerbaijan SSR into compliance with its status as a sovereign republic within the USSR."

It would appear that after raising the issue in this manner, the law should enumerate the legislative acts of the Azerbaijan SSR which do not correspond to its status and indicate that they are annulled. Meanwhile, the law does not even refer to them. One gets the impression from the law that the Azerbaijan SSR is a founding republic of the union. The law notes that "the competence of the Azerbaijan SSR is restricted only with regard to the issues voluntarily delegated by the republic itself to the Union of SSR [Soviet Socialist Republics]" (Article 2). Further on: "Mutual relations between the Azerbaijan SSR and the Union of SSR are developed on a treaty basis" (Article 4). Meanwhile, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the UkSSR [Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic], the BeSSR [Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Transcaucasian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic were the founding republics. Azerbaijan was also a part of the latter, together with Georgia and Armenia. It should be recalled that Azerbaijan emerged as an independent union republic endowed with full rights after the elimination of the Transcaucasian Federation in 1936, as well as the Georgian and Armenian SSR. Consequently, mutual relations between the Azerbaijan SSR and the USSR proceed not from the Treaty on Forming the USSR, but from the USSR Constitution, which both the Constitution of the Azerbaijan SSR and the constitutional laws of this republic should comply with. Raising the issue in this manner is not an accident, because the authors of the law knew full-well point 1 of Article 73 of the USSR Constitution, according to which the formation of autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts within union republics (as well as their cancellation) becomes legally valid only after its confirmation by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Point 3 of Article 12 of the law attributes such powers to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Azerbaijan SSR. The provision on the territories of the Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and the NKAO being "an inalienable part of Azerbaijan" found in Article 5 is likewise bewildering. This is nothing but an obituary for the right of nations to self- determination.

The law also indicates that "any interference with the resolution of issues which constitute an inalienable right of the Azerbaijan SSR should be considered an infringement upon its sovereign rights" (Article 2). A quite legitimate question arises: Who is interfering with resolving these issues? There is not a word about it in the law.

Article 6 states that "the USSR laws which **do not infringe upon the sovereign rights of the Azerbaijan SSR** apply in the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR." Another legitimate issue arises: Which USSR laws violate the sovereign rights of the Azerbaijan SSR and cease to operate in the territory of that republic? There is no answer to this, either.

I believe that the adoption of this law pursued just one goal- -to fully renounce, at the level of a constitutional law of a union republic, Lenin's principle of self-determination of nations, which constitutes the foundation for building our soviet socialist multinational union state.

[Question] At present, what do you consider to be the main obstacle to a just resolution of this issue?

[Nazaryan] More precisely, we should say obstacles. The first one looks quite attractive at first sight within its verbal cocoon. The reasoning is approximately as follows: There is no need for fundamental changes in the sociopolitical, economic, and spiritual life because in the process of perestroyka these problems will disappear or will solve themselves, and all we need to do is wait. With regard to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, this means that solving it should be postponed indefinitely in the conviction that the reasons for it will peter out with the passage of time, and one day this problem will solve itself. Given this perception of the ways to solve the problem, it is mechanically transferred from the ethnic-political realm into that of management and economics. This frame of mind is not new. It also existed at the outset when an attempt was made to reject completely the ethnic aspect of the problem and reduce it to local measures of a social and economic nature.

At present, we are dealing with an improved version of the same frame of mind whereby the ethnic aspect of the problem is acknowledged but solving it is tied to long-range measures of a social and cultural nature.

[Question] That is, you mean to say that not only our concepts and ideas aimed at a just solution of the problem have evolved, but also the concepts and ideas of its opponents?

[Nazaryan] Absolutely correct. The opponents of a just solution to the problem of Karabakh are not at all passive. However, we should take into account the fact that broad strata of the public in our country are now concerned about the problem. The opinion and pronouncements of the public are acquiring paramount significance. Within the framework of this burning issue another barrier which has arisen in our path is found. The point is that our most orthodox opponents are circulating the following monstrous argument version which enjoys popularity, strange as it may be—that the claims by Armenians are the fruit of unjustified demands by an ungrateful people which has been afforded hospitality in the neighboring republic. That is, the situation of the Karabakh Armenians is presented as similar to the situation which has developed in, say, the Baltic republics, where certain frictions have developed between the indigenous and nonindigenous population. Certainly, different things are at issue in these instances. However, there is superficial similarity which the falsifiers proceed from. It is found in the fact that in both cases there is a rapid growth of ethnic self-awareness which is caused by perestroyka and the democratization of public life. If you do not know the entire truth on Karabakh, it is easy to believe this version.

In light of what I have said, I believe that the most significant and timely task of our intellectuals is to explain in simple terms and patiently to all the nations and peoples of our multinational country that the demand by Armenians is not at all a claim by the nonindigenous population living in another republic. In essence, it concerns the goal of social and ethnic rehabilitation of a segment of the Armenian people which lives on its native land, the land of its ancestors.

The bitter fate of our people has given rise to a domestic and foreign diaspora. We also have an argument as weighty as the lack of claims for someone else's land by Armenians who have lived for centuries in Krasnodar, Batumi, Rostov-na-Donu, and other regions. The above also fully applies to the communities of Armenians in the foreign diaspora.

In one of my appearances on television I stressed that the Armenians have never claimed someone else's land. Unfortunately, this concept and the fact that our people have become victims of national injustice perpetrated by Stalin and his comrades-in-arms have not been grasped by quite a few people.

[Question] Being the head of the chair of state law at the Yerevan State University, you, Vladimir Rubenovich, have taken part as a consultant in discussing the issue associated with the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. Your statements in the press and on television in which you are called upon to explain to the broad circles of the public the essence of the problem and its various aspects, are widely known. Has the high office of the procurator of the republic influenced your position—that is, does it constrain you with regard to this important issue?

[Nazaryan] By no means. I will tell you why. The Karabakh issue has had unambiguous significance since the day it appeared, and still does, and consequently, may have an unambiguous solution. No office, whether that of the procurator of the republic or a higher one, can influence the objective heart of this problem. My position remains absolutely the same as before. At present, I am prepared to sign all of my articles and speeches without avoiding a single word or sentence. Being the author of the small article "The People Are the Authors," which was published in the newspaper KHORURDAIN AYASTAN in its time, is a great honor for me. The article appears to be still current.

I believe that the essence of the issue is now understood by all except those who deliberately do not want it, who deliberately circumvent the clear and simple sense of this burning issue.

As the procurator of the republic, I sign on a daily basis decisions on rehabilitating the victims of Stalinist repressions. I sincerely believe that the time has long since come to draw up a decision on the rehabilitation of Nagorno-Karabakh. The officials who will have the honor of signing it will deserve our sincere, good envy and admiration. Therefore, the work of the procurator not only fails to restrict me, but puts me in touch with the Karabakh issue every day.

[Question] Once again about Karabakh: At the time the problem developed, yours was an optimistic position. Do you continue to hold it now that the problem has entered a qualitatively new stage of its development?

[Nazaryan] Yes, I do. My optimism is at a new stage as well. It is based on a reasonable and realistic analysis of facts and circumstances. At present, a solution to the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh requires intensive intellectual work. At present, the mobilization of the intellectual potential of the republic with a view to creating a favorable social environment is the most current issue. It is very important to ensure that at present at least a substantial segment of the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the USSR people's deputies, if not a majority of them, have on the whole a correct idea of the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh, know that within its framework they are dealing with a just demand by a segment of the Armenian people torn from their motherland during the severe time of Stalinism, the people which have been shamelessly oppressed for decades.

Such an understanding should bring about desirable political and legal results both in the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the near future, if not right away.

NKAO Party Organizations To Join Armenian Party

NC2112165289 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Report by ARMENPRES special correspondent A. Grigoryan: "Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO): This Is the Will of the Communists"]

[Text] Stepanakert, 20 Dec (ARMENPRES)—As previously reported, the plenum of the Stepanakert City Party Committee has decided to ask the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee to consider accepting the Stepanakert party organization into the party structure of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

Similar decisions were also made by the Mardakertskiy, Martuninskiy, Askeranskiy, and Hadrutskiy Rayon Party Committees plenum sessions at the end of last week. ARMENPRES correspondent asked Valeriy Grigoryan, head of the organizational, party, and cadre work department of the party apparatus of the NKAO Special Administration Committee, to comment on this development.

[Grigoryan] The country's leadership has adopted a stance toward the NKAO problem over almost the last 2 years, a stance which manifested itself more clearly at the first and second Congress of People's Deputies as well as at the session of the country's Supreme Soviet. This stance is convincing us that the center is unwilling to assume the responsibility for a just solution of that problem. Or, and this is difficult to believe, it is frightened by the tedious repetition of warnings about unforeseeable consequences. Or, it might be that Moscow is simply frightened by the precedent of national Leninist self-determination within the country; not only the NKAO population was used as a pawn in the political game of the time. Or, it could even be that Moscow lacks complete and objective information about the situation in the NKAO.

Let's not engage in predictions. One thing is clear: the people themselves must decide about their own self-determination; nobody else will do that for them. Besides, to have expectations of others is illogical. That is why we believe no institution has the moral right to question the decision of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council on the reunification of Armenia and NKAO—for the simple reason that reunification is the will of the Armenian people.

We realize that the CPSU Central Committee might not agree with such an approach. However, CPSU regulations stipulate that the oblast party organization is empowered to undertake all work of implementing the party's policy within the oblast's borders. This we must do, proceeding from the interest of our country and certainly from the interests of our people. The decision of the overwhelming majority of the communists of Artsakh [NKAO] to appeal to the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee with the request to incorporate the oblast party organizations into the Armenian SSR party organization—a decision which had already manifested itself during the previous plenums of the party rayon and city committees and at the meetings of the grassroots party organizations—is nothing else but the practical realization of the people's will. As is obvious, the party is the expression of the interests of the people and serves them.

Let us be sincere. To my mind, the further preservation of the oblast party organization within the structure of the Azerbaijan Communist Party is, to say the least, absurd. For almost 70 years the Azerbaijan party leadership has pursued a policy of trampling upon the most elemental rights of the NKAO people with the intent of forcing them out of their native lands. That very policy, and not the attitude of the NKAO Armenians toward the Azeri population in the oblast, was the reason for the emergence of the NKAO problem, which we could fully define as a national liberation movement. Alas, that policy has not changed even these days as is evident in the negative stance Azerbaijanis adopted toward the latest decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on NKAO. This decision is completely unacceptable to the Artsakh people. As the saying goes, all the cards are on the table. Azerbaijan wants an NKAO without rights and without Armenians, and that is something with which the people of Artsakh will never be reconciled.

Let us hope, said V. Grigoryan in conclusion, that our request will be received with understanding by the communists and all the workers of the Armenian SSR.

Armenian Local Soviets' Terms of Office Extended

NC2112141589 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 21 Dec 89

[Text] In connection with the expiration of the terms of office of the 20th convocation of the local soviets of people's deputies of the Armenian Republic on 19 December 1989, the presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet has, in accordance with Article 13 of the basic law of the Armenian Republic concerning the election of the local soviets of people's deputies, decided to extend the deputies' terms of office until new elections are held.

Georgia Social Democratic Official Interviewed

90US0228A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 2 Nov 89 pp 4-5, 7

[Interview with Prof Guram Muchaidze by E. Kakabadze: "There Is No Value Higher Than Man"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] The foundations of the Georgian Social Democratic Party (GSDP) are being laid in the republic. We believe that it deserves to be introduced even at this stage. And this is why. The Bolshevik movement was conceived on the basis of social democracy, and the latter has since that time been in terms of its program aims closer to the Communist Party than any other party. Both the policy of the CPSU, which is geared at the present time to rapprochement and dialogue with the world's social democratic parties, and the processes occurring in a number of socialist countries testify to this.

MOLODEZH GRUZII's questions are answered by Professor Guram Muchaidze, member of the organizing committee preparing the constituent congress of the GSDP and head of the Department of Marxism-Leninism of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers Economic Management Institute.

Guram Muchaidze was born in Tbilisi in 1948 to a worker's family.

He graduated from the History Faculty of Tbilisi State University and was awarded for his thesis the degree of candidate of historical sciences. At the age of 30 he defended his doctoral dissertation on the history of Marxism.

He worked as full-time deputy secretary of the Tbilisi State University Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Committee and as assistant professor and professor at the university.

As of 1980 he was a consultant of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department and head of the Scientific Communism Department of the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute Georgian Branch.

From 1986 through the present he has been head of the Department of Marxism-Leninism of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers Economic Management Institute.

He has been a member of the CPSU since 1971.

He is married, with two daughters.

[Kakabadze] Batono Guram, as you know there was a social democratic party in Georgia. Is the party you are forming its successor?

[Muchaidze] The idea of the formation of a Georgian social democratic party was in the wind. We were prompted to action by the 9 April events. The morning following the tragedy we set up an action committee, which was composed mainly of staff and students of the university, for the convening of a special Georgian Communist Party congress. An appeal to all Communists of the republic was prepared, and a signature-gathering campaign began. The party rules permit the convening of a special congress if this is demanded by one-third of the party organization's Communists. But in view of the imposition of the curfew, this campaign was temporarily suspended. After the curfew was lifted the work was resumed, and resolutions demanding the convening of a special congress were adopted at a number of meetings of primary party organizations. These resolutions were forwarded to the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee. But there was no response to them.

It was after this, in a state of disenchantment regarding any change in the Communist Party "at the top," that it was decided to recreate the GSDP. We are essentially repeating what has happened in Hungary. But the new party there was formed on the basis of the old one "from the top," but in Georgia steps are being taken to create a new, social democratic party based on the Communist Party "from below."

I consider abnormal a situation whereby in the Communist Party itself two political forces—supporters of perestroyka or the "left," and opponents of perestroyka or the "right"—have distinctly emerged. They cannot and should not be in the same party. The reformist forces in the CPSU must structure themselves organizationally. Proceeding from this, we believe a new party should be formed on the basis of the existing one.

[Kakabadze] Are you talking about the possibility of the formation of two communist parties, as in some countries?

[Muchaidze] No. Those countries will not serve us an example, for the communist parties there have not been in power and have not compromised themselves like the CPSU. The situation with us is different. On account of the fact that the Communist Party usurped power and throughout its existence has had no opposition, it has degenerated and essentially betrayed the interests of the working class and the interests of socialism, for the society that has been built in our country is not socialism.

In addition, the party in our country is corrupt. The bribetakers are mainly officials, and the officials are members of the CPSU as a rule. There is no escaping this. This is why it is essential to change not only the content of the Communist Party but also its name. Lenin, after all, once did this, renaming the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party the Communist Party. There is now in our country a reverse turn of events, but on a qualitatively new basis. We are returning to the sources of social democracy.

[Kakabadze] At what stage is the GSDP currently?

[Muchaidze] The party is at the formation stage. A meeting of representatives of social democratic groups, at which the organizing committee and editorial board were elected, was held on 28 September.

[Kakabadze] Whom did these representatives include?

[Muchaidze] On the organizing committee, 10 persons: myself, Prof Guram Koranashvili, Dzhemal Kakhniashvili and Demuri Bakhtadze, assistant professors at Tbilisi State University, Rezo Tsakadze, assistant professor of the GSSR Council of Ministers Economic Management Institute, Vazha Shubitidze, assistant professor of the Georgian Polytechnical Institute Scientific Communism Department, and others.

On the editorial board, Zurab Abashidze, executive secretary of the journal SAKARTVELOS KHELOVNEBA, Shalva Todua and Vakhtang Tatunashvili, employees of the newspaper SAKHALKHO GANATLEBA, Giya Talakhadze, assistant professor of the Georgian Polytechnical Institute Philosophy Department, and others.

[Kakabadze] Has the party structure been worked out?

[Muchaidze] The structure of the future party will be distinctive. The party will have a chairman and two deputies. One deputy will direct the Central Committee, the other, the central organ. We are for bicentrism in the party. The newspaper must be independent of the Central Committee and have the right within the framework of the party rules and program to criticize the party leadership. Each of them will have their own functions: the Central Committee, the solution of organizational questions, the organ, propaganda questions. But both will be autonomous. A triumvirate—a chairman and two deputies—will thus be created, which will rule out the concentration of power in single hands.

Further, it is proposed to create primary party organizations not per the place of work, as now, but per the place of residence—that is, by constituency. Why? First, because production should not be politicized, and the workforce should not be made an arena of political struggle and political rivalry. Second, the party aspires to power, and power is won by the parliamentary path and by participation in elections, and election campaigns are already under way in the constituencies. Proceeding from this, we will create primary organizations per the territorial principle. All normal parties are created in this way. And in this case—and this is very much our hope—a multiparty system will have been legalized in our country, and the Communist Party will have been forced to withdraw its primary organizations from the workforce. This process has already begun in Hungary, incidentally.

The creation of social democratic groups both at the citizens' place of residence and at their place of work is proposed prior to the party's constituent congress.

As distinct from the current Communist Party, we will accord the minority the right to defend its position, appeal directly to the party masses, dissociate itself organizationally, or quit the party.

[Kakabadze] On what basis is the GSDP program being drawn up?

[Muchaidze] The fact that the Social Democratic Party is returning to its roots and being created on the basis of the Communist Party is testimony to the fact that it will be socialist. It will adhere to socialist principles and will build socialism. But by socialism it understands democratic socialism.

In drawing up the program we will proceed basically from the program declaration of the Socialist International, which was adopted this June at a Socialist International congress in Stockholm, but we will also take as a basis the programs of social democratic parties of countries in which they are the governing parties or enjoy great authority. In addition, we will study also the program documents of the Georgian Social Democratic Workers Party, which was in power in the 1918-1921 period. Incidentally, Georgia was the first country in world history to opt for the path of democratic socialism. The first social democratic experiment took place with us.

[Kakabadze] Inasmuch as we have touched on history, permit me to ask you a very ticklish question. If it is considered that Georgian social democrats are accused of complicity in the murder of Ilya Chavchavadze, can you, as their direct successors, hope for the sympathy and support of the people?

[Muchaidze] I anticipated this question and am prepared to answer it.

Ilya Chavchavadze was killed in 1907. By that time social democracy in Georgia was already split into Bolsheviks (the communists) and Mensheviks (the social democrats). Ilya Chavchavadze's murder is on the Bolsheviks' conscience. Some people maintain, it is true, that Noe Zhordaniya, leader of the Social Democratic Workers Party, was present at the meeting at which this matter was discussed, but this was not the case. Mamiya Berishvili, a leader of the Georgian Social Democratic Workers Party Overseas Bureau, who visited Tbilisi recently and had a meeting with us, declared that in this period Zhordaniya was in exile in Finland. He promised

to send the appropriate archival material to us from Paris. So the charge against the social democrats of the murder of Ilya Chavchavadze is without proof.

[Kakabadze] To all appearances, you intend, via an overseas bureau, to establish contacts with the European social democratic parties...

[Muchaidze] Yes, we will avail ourselves of this channel also, the more so in that Batoni Mamiya consented to assist in the establishment of contacts with Western parties. In addition, we have already sent off a letter to the Socialist International Secretariat, whose headquarters are in London, and a second letter to Socialist International Chairman Willy Brandt in Bonn, in which we notified them of the formation of our party and requested assistance in obtaining material on the activity of the Socialist International and other social democratic parties.

Similar letters have been sent to Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Moscow, where social democratic parties and organizations are already functioning. We are hoping for close contacts with them.

[Kakabadze] What are the conditions of party membership?

[Muchaidze] Every enfranchised citizen of Georgia, regardless of nationality and religious belief, who acknowledges the party program and rules, pays his membership dues, and contributes in the form acceptable to him to realization of the party's program tasks may become a member of the GSDP.

The GSDP is a parliamentary-type popular party of the working people. It sets as its goal the assumption of office and aspires with observance of constitutional provisions to win a majority in the soviets of all levels, form its own government, and by way of reforms create a sovereign law-based state founded on the ideas of democratic socialism.

There is no higher goal and value for the GSDP than man. It is guided in its activity by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, and the summary documents of the Vienna meeting.

[Kakabadze] You are opening the party's doors also to people who cleave to various ideological schools...

[Muchaidze] Yes, this is the case. Representatives of various ideological schools, but driven by a single goal—freedom, justice and the people's well-being—may join the GSDP. We are categorically opposed to the monopolism of some one world outlook, Marxism-Leninism, say, and believe that there should be world-outlook pluralism. Our ideological sources are Christian ethics, the Enlightenment, humanist philosophy, and Marxist sociology—that is, Marx's teachings on history and society, and also the experience of the workers, national liberation movements, the struggle for women's emancipation, and so forth.

[Kakabadze] Social democrats on a world scale are serious opposition to the communist parties. Do you believe that they will in our country also become such an influential political force?

[Muchaidze] First, it should be said that our endeavor to recreate a social democratic party here is not a tribute to fashion and not the subjective desires of a particular group of people. It is an objective regularity. The fact of the emergence of social democratic parties in the near-Baltic or, as they themselves say, Baltic republics, in Moscow and other of Russia's industrial centers, in Poland, in Hungary and even in the GDR, which is considered the most conservative country in our "socialist camp," testifies to this. So, I repeat, it is an objective regularity and reality. And we also sensed this, which was why we began work on the creation of the party. We believe that this party answsers the need of our society also to see a serious political alternative to the Communist Party. Our activity is a response to this objective need, and we believe the GSDP will constitute the opposition to the existing Georgian Communist Party.

[Kakabadze] And in the present situation?

[Muchaidze] In the present situation I believe that the governing party has no serious competitors, despite the fact that a mass of informal organizations has been formed. A party may be opposed only by a party. And although many of the informals call themselves parties, they are not such essentially because each political party laying claim to power must have a clear-cut program. And not only in the sphere of national development, but also in the sphere of policy, the economy, and the social sphere and encompass the whole spectrum and all seams of social life. And inasmuch as the organizations which exist currently and call themselves parties are confining themselves merely to national problems and making national independence an end in itself, they are limiting the sphere of their activity. Their mass character and popularity among the public are based mainly on the emotional mood. But there is no serious political platform behind them.

[Kakabadze] Let us contine the subject of the informals. Your relations with them.

[Muchaidze] I wish to mention first of all—and this is material—that the informals have made a significant contribution to the awakening of national self-awareness. Second, they have politicized society. Third, they have also played a tremendous part in the growth in the people's social assertiveness also. They have, in addition, contributed to a stimulation of the Communist Party itself as well. All this has to be seen.

On the other hand, I, for example, cannot consider acceptable certain of their forms and methods of struggle and the banning of the existence of a faction within a party. They remind me in some respects of the Bolsheviks, with their ultra-left methods of struggle. Political

struggle today must be conducted by democratic, parliamentary methods. How, then, should we evaluate the boycott of the elections announced by certain informal associations?

If an organization declares that it has in its arsenal only peaceful means of political struggle, it cannot announce an election boycott because this means renunciation of the parliamentary path. Such a boycott was once announced by the Bolsheviks, but they were then oriented toward armed uprising... Although the informals pay lip service to a rejection of armed struggle, acting in an ill-considered manner in a number of instances they provide yet another excuse for the use of military force against them. They wish to create a popular parliament as a counterweight to the Georgian Supreme Soviet, but this parliament would not have a legal basis and would be an unconstitutional body, and the authorities would, in any event, have every legal right to break it up with the use of force.

For this reason we believe that the sole form of political struggle should be parliamentary. Only via parliament is it possible to come to power and implement one's program. Poland is an example.

In connection with the informals, I would like to add just this. The rehabilitation of those illegally repressed in the 1930's and 1940's and at the start of the 1950's is currently under way, but those punished for dissidence in the stagnation years are not being politically rehabilitated for some reason or other. The stigma of political criminal has yet to be removed from Merab Kostav, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Georgiy Chanturiya, Irakliy Tsereteli, and others.

[Kakabadze] So we conclude that the sole real political force remains as yet the Communist Party. How do you evaluate its present policy, which differs appreciably from that which it pursued until recently?

[Muchaidze] Indeed, beginning 9 April (it so happened that the tragic events of this day were pivotal in the political life of the republic) the leadership of the Georgian Communist Party has taken a number of steps and devised several interesting concepts of Georgia's national and economic independence. But devising a good concept is one thing, implementing it is another. We have seen no practical steps as yet. Even specific problems of intra-party life are not being solved quickly enough. Cadre questions are being decided slowly, and there is no hurry to convene a Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which is to make a political evaluation of the 9 April events, and convene a special session of the republic Supreme Soviet, which is to enact a number of legislative instruments. And all this is supercharging the atmosphere in the republic. Therefore, when evaluating the activity of our Communist Party we need to proceed from practical action, and only from practical steps may we judge the extent to which the party has turned in the direction of the requirements of society and the people.

[Kakabadze] How would you assess the present political situation in the republic?

[Muchaidze] As explosive. Any delay on the part of the government in the solution of this urgent question or the other could serve as the spark. True, radical structural reforms in the party itself are needed for decisive action. It will not restore its authority and win the people's confidence with the old concepts and the old methods.

[Kakabadze] Batono Guram, is it not the case that it is easier giving advice then doing something oneself. There is total criticism of the governing party, but those doing the criticizing go no further than this.

[Muchaidze] Criticism is the main function of an opposition party, this is why it is in opposition. As far as practical work is concerned, this is possible only if the opposition party assumes office. Until this time its alternative program serves as the equivalent of practical work.

[Kakabadze] Inasmuch as the GSDP does not conceal its pretensions to office, might we expect the nomination of your candidates at the coming elections?

[Muchaidze] Yes, but before the start of the elections we will have to have taken legal shape as a party, that is, by next spring have held a GSDP congress. But even in this case we would without official registration be unable to nominate candidates from the party. We will field our representatives from the territorial okrugs.

We have already begun preparation of an election platform. The problems which need to be tackled at this stage even are being elaborated therein.

A few words about the new election bill. It may be considered a step forward, but, nonetheless, I would like to mention an appreciable shortcoming also: It is not oriented toward a multiparty structure. Yet the existence of a multiparty system is now a reality, which it is essential to recognize legally. But first, it seems to me, the Communist Party itself needs to be registered. It has not yet, after all, been registered here and from the legal viewpoint appears as an informal organization. True, some people believe that Article 6 of the Constitution is registration. But this clause was inserted in the Basic Law only in 1977. In this case it transpires that prior to 1977 the party was illegal, but now the question of the removal of Article 6 is being posed, and were this to happen the CPSU would once again be illegal.

For the registration of political parties, the CPSU primarily, it is essential that we enact the party law. Both the CPSU and other parties which operate within the framework of the Constitution should be registered on the basis of this law and others banned. Let us hope that this happens.

[Kakabadze] How are inter-ethnic relations interpreted from the GSDP standpoint?

[Muchaidze] Interethnic conflict, which has occurred in the republic, does neither Georgians, Abkhazians, Ossetians, Azerbaijanis nor anyone any credit since it is equally harmful to all and disunites our forces. It is important now to consolidate in the name of realization of the program of perestroyka, in the name of the democratization of our society. We must all understand that without democratization the winning of national freedom is impossible.

And then it is necessary to clearly delineate the causes and effects of these conflicts. We believe that the main cause of national conflicts is not so much problems of an interethnic nature as problems of a systemic nature. Were all the union republics and autonomous formations complete masters of their destiny, if the people lived without want and without day-to-day social problems, and if everyone lived as well as in Sweden, say, no one would be raising the question of withdrawal from the USSR. But inasmuch as elementary living problems have not been solved, separatist sentiments are for this reason intensifying. Whence the conclusion: Remove the main causes and thereby remove not only national, but also social and political tension.

[Kakabadze] Is the question of withdrawal from the USSR in order to solve all one's problems independently legitimate, from your viewpoint?

[Muchaidze] We believe that it should not be a question of separation at this stage. It should be a question of removal of the factors leading to this. If within the framework of the union all national requirements are satisfied, social problems are resolved, political freedom is granted, and the economy develops in the right direction, integration processes will naturally gain the ascendancy over disintegration processes. Note that the European states are opening their borders, and integration is under way. But we need integration, of course, not at the expense of the republics' sovereignty but on the basis of freely developing nations, on the basis of recognition of the complete sovereignty of the peoples. Only thus is it possible to preserve conditions of interethnic concord.

[Kakabadze] And what should the ideal USSR look like in your understanding?

[Muchaidze] It is essential, in our view, to convert the present union into a union of independent states whereby these states conclude agreements only in the military and foreign policy spheres. And each republic has here the right of veto—that is, all questions would be decided by consensus. In everything else, full independence.

We need to break off relations within the framework of the Union in order to subsequently unite once again on a voluntary basis.

[Kakabadze] What does the GSDP's economic platform represent?

[Muchaidze] The economic platform is as follows: a market system, competition, free enterprise, indirect state regulation of the economy, and planning by recommendation. We are for a diversity of forms of ownership. There should be group ownership, state ownership, municipal ownership, private ownership, and mixed ownership. In the private sector a substantial amount of the surplus value will be appropriated not by the employer, but will be used to satisfy the needs and requirements of the workers employed at the given enterprise.

We are for realization of the slogan advanced back at the time of the October Revolution: factories and plants to the workers in group ownership, the land to the peasants in private ownership, and, consequently, we are for private farming.

We believe that without realization of this program, extricating the republic and, yes, the country as a whole from the severe economic crisis will be impossible.

Our social program is also closely connected with the economic program.

The basis of the well-being of each individual should be labor, and citizens who are not fit for work should be taken care of by the state. We support the unity of the consumer market. With us it is bifurcated, unfortunately: the elite enjoy one market, the working people, another. There was no such bifurcation in tsarist Russia even, nor is there such in any capitalist country. It is essential to establish the equality of the materialization of earned income.

[Kakabadze] How is all this being received in the work force?

[Muchaidze] With understanding and agreement, to a large extent. But the point is that there show up on our heels in the same outfits senior party officials, who agitate against us... Although we believe that it would be more honest to meet in "open battle" and reveal who's who, as in your rubric.

[Kakabadze] You have said that you intend publishing your own paper...

[Muchaidze] The editorial board is already working in this direction: a base is being sought, material is being assembled, and articles are being prepared for publication. The newspaper will be called ERTOBA (Unity), like the organ of the Georgian Social Democratic Workers Party which appeared in the period 1918-1921. Unity is precisely what we lack currently.

In addition, we intend to publish three very interesting, in our view, brochures. One is "Problems and Prospects of Socialism in Georgia" by Kark Kautsky. It was published here in 1920, when the leaders of the Second International came to Georgia to study the first social democratic experiment. It was at that time that this work, very interesting in my view, was written.

Now, however, I would like—with the permission of MOLODEZH GRUZII and with its assistance, we not having our own organ as yet—to make public the text of our "Appeal to the Citizens of Georgia."

Georgia, like all of the Soviet Union, is in a state of most severe crises—political, economic, moral and ethical and interethnic. The people are deprived of the most elementary things—foodstuffs and basic necessities.

Responsibility for the country having been brought to the brink of catastrophe is borne by the Communist Party, which has lost authority among the working people. Over 300,000 people quit the CPSU in 1988.

All that has been said above testifies to the need for the unification of the progressive, democratic forces of our society—both Communists and nonparty people, regardless of nationality, religious belief, social position and philosophy—in the GSDP, the ideological successor of history's first social democratic experiment implemented in independent Georgia in 1918-1921.

As a parliamentary-type popular party of the working people, it is the mission of the GSDP to be an integral part of the Socialist International, prominent figures of which are W. Brandt, F. Mitterrand, F. Gonzalez, Sh. Peres and many others.

The ideal of social democracy is democratic socialism presupposing the creation of a law-based state, the establishment of a multiparty pluralist democracy, and the functioning of free trade unions and an independent press. Democratic socialism is inseparable from a mixed, market economy incorporating also socialized private property. A striking example of democratic socialism is contemporary Sweden.

The GSDP aspires to the achievement of Georgia's complete economic and political independence. As a precondition for this the Soviet Union should be converted into a free and open alliance of independent states. The Social Democratic Party condemns Soviet Russia's armed intervention of 25 February 1921, as a result of which Georgia lost state independence. Georgia's social democrats are guided by seven principles: national liberty, political pluralism, economic self-management, social justice, environmental safety, demographic balance, and exterior openness.

We call on you to form social democratic groups at your place of work and residence. We request that you communicate information thereon to Room 219, Economic Management Institute, 6, ulitsa Chitadze, Tbilisi, tel: 93-79-21.

[Kakabadze] Final question. How do you view the future?

[Muchaidze] With optimism.

Article on Crime Rate, Presumption of Innocence

90UN0514A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 p 4

[Article by lawyer Yu. Gruzinov: "Law and Emotions, or Why]

[Text] **Courts are facing difficult problems today. People expect from them a reaction commensurate with the growth of crime. Society demands from them the toughest defense of the people's rights and interests. Many people are unhappy, and justifiably so, about the number of crimes solved and about the quality of preliminary investigations. In such a situation the judges should react a lot more keenly to all the details of the cases they consider. They need to be genuinely concerned about the victims' rights. At the same time they should avoid leaning too hard toward accusations. It is especially important under the present conditions when one can hear more and more often that the courts display too humane an attitude and thus contribute to the increase in crime. Judges should hold as sacred one of the basic principles of any democratic jurisprudence—the presumption of innocence. But it becomes the most often forgotten factor, especially when public emotions are on the rise.**

In Ashkhabad they were trying the deputy chief of the investigation department of the Sovetskiy ROVD [rayon department of internal affairs], Gulam Nourusov. While investigating the criminal case of Begaliyev, accused of attempted black market dealings, Nourusov took over the case, which was tied up in red tape by then, and he also took over the material evidence. The latter consisted of spare parts for a Zhiguli car. A short time later he signed over the evidence, as required by law, to the Ashkhabad ARTs VAZ [Volzhskiy automobile factory repair center] to be kept there until the court decision. But it seems that there the evidence was destroyed. Nourusov was accused of conspiring with Begaliyev for the purpose of replacing the spare parts with old ones. Besides, he was also accused of stealing the evidence and of abusing his position.

Meanwhile, Begaliyev himself vehemently denied any conspiracy with Nourusov. There was no proof that the latter had any part in the destruction of the evidence. It remained unclear when, how, for what purpose, and under what circumstances Nourusov conspired with Begaliyev and stole the evidence. It was not disclosed how he abused his position, what his selfish motives were, and "other personal involvement." But then the idea of finding guilty the deputy chief of the investigation department himself seemed so exciting that the presumption of innocence was totally ignored.

Here is another story. Driver M. Gichchibekov was sentenced to 5 ½ years of prison. While they were hearing this criminal case the judges had no doubts: The defendant was guilty of the automobile accident. But all the time during the trial one could not get rid of the feeling that the judges' opinion had been formed beforehand as if they were influenced by something.

The investigation proved without a doubt that on a foggy day two trucks collided on a highway 44 kilometers from the city of Elista. A Skoda truck traveling at high speed and carrying no load crashed into a KamAZ [Kama automobile factory] semi-trailer which was carrying a load of 12.5 tons. Gichchibekov was driving the KamAZ, and Kleiner was the driver of the Skoda. Two MAZ [Minsk automobile factory] trucks were headed in the same direction as the KamAZ and were in the same lane, but it remained unclear whether they were moving or not. Gichchibekov tried to pass them after he made sure there was no traffic in the opposite direction, but at that moment the Skoda ran into his truck. Gichchibekov managed to brake and at the moment of collision his truck was practically stationary.

The driver of the Skoda, N. Kleiner, did not contradict Gichchibekov's statement and did not deny that MAZ trucks were really present in his lane and could have been standing. But he insisted that his lights were on and therefore Gichchibekov should have seen his truck. He also claimed that he had braked but in the course of the investigation it was proved without any doubt that Kleiner committed several very serious violations of the traffic rules. He exceeded the speed limit allowed for the given weather conditions, he did not have his lights on and did not do emergency braking.

However, the investigation ended in a compromise decision: It was decided to indict both drivers. Later, the investigator was summoned to the deputy procurator of the Kalmytskaya ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], A. Korniyenko, and he was given a written order on the procuracy letterhead to close the investigation of Kleiner's case. Gichchibekov was taken into custody right after this.

The judges did not concentrate their attention on many aspects of the case. They, as well as the offices that dealt with the case later, neglected its many unclear and unproven points, contradictions, and obvious discrepancies.

A certain Lavrinov ran over a woman when he was driving his Zhiguli. The woman later died. Lavrinov claimed that as he was greatly upset right after the tragedy he drank a whole bottle of valerian tincture from his first aid kit. As everybody knows the tincture is prepared with alcohol. No one refuted this, but it played a fateful role in future. The medical examination revealed that Lavrinov had insignificant traces of residual alcohol in his body. This became a decisive factor at the trial.

At the same time the investigators discovered that the victim violated the traffic rules and therefore endangered herself. They also established that she had very poor eyesight but at the time of the accident had no glasses on. Also, the technical expert unequivocally stated that Lavrinov had technically no opportunity to stop the car in time to avoid hitting the woman. However, none of this was taken into account by the court.

We have had enough examples. Let us better think this over: How can it be that one, even if false, version of a case is sufficient for the court to avoid a detailed, complete, and objective consideration of the case? In Nourusov's case destroying evidence became such a version even though it had nothing to do with him. In Gichchibekov's case it was swerving into the opposite traffic lane while no other circumstances were acknowledged. In Lavrinov's case it was the traces of residual alcohol which in no way did or could influence the technical possibility of avoiding the tragedy.

It is easy to understand the feelings of the judges hearing criminal cases. All the more so, if they involve loss of human life. Nevertheless, emotions and preference decisions cannot rule at trials. The court should be guided entirely by law. If the judges consider certain materials without clear proof of them they should be used in favor of the defendant, but not against him. And this is the essence of the presumption of innocence.

KGB Apprehends Donetsk Racketeers

90UN0394B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 17 Nov 89 p 3

[RATAU report: ""Concerning the Arrest of Extortioners"]

[Text] Officials of the Directorate of the KGB for Donetsk Oblast and the UVD [Directorate of Internal Affairs] of the Donetsk Ispolkom [executive committee] carried out an operation in the oblast center on 3 November to disarm a group of racketeers and catch them red-handed in an attempt to obtain a large sum of money from a cooperative worker. The persons arrested are residents of the city of Donetsk who were previously tried for the distribution of drugs and for hooliganism.

On 11 November, the organs of internal affairs and state security of Nikolayev Oblast seized an extortioner red-handed who was previously tried for criminal offenses and the blackmail of a resident of the city of Nikolayev.

Legal proceedings have been initiated by the directorates of internal affairs of the Donetsk and Nikolayev oblispolkoms [oblast soviet executive committee]. An investigation is under way.

Serious Crime Increasing in Belorussian SSR

90UN0394A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 17 Nov 89 p 3

[BELTA report: "Meeting of the Presidium of the BSSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The question "Concerning Measures for Intensifying the Fight Against Crime in the Republic" was examined at a meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] held on 14 November.

The urgency of this problem is obvious—the level of crime in Belorussia is increasing sharply. It was noted at the meeting that for 9 months of this year about 47,000 crimes were recorded, or almost 37% more than the corresponding period of last year. The largest increase occurred in the Vitebsk and Minsk oblasts, and the cities of Borisov, Vitebsk, Minsk, Polotsk, and Svetlogorsk.

Crime is assuming a more and more organized and professional character. Every tenth crime is committed by a group of persons, and many are committed with particular daring and cynicism. There are twice as many criminal acts in public places. The number of robberies, assaults, rapes, and the theft of state property and the property of citizens increased significantly.

Many economic and official crimes are uncovered at enterprises of the food, meat and milk, and fruit and vegetable branches that fall under the jurisdiction of the Belorussian SSR Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee]. Profiteering and the associated abuse of trade by workers have assumed a mass character.

And what about the law enforcement organs? The organization of preventive work, their operational capabilities, and the material-technical base are not suitable for the situation that has developed. This lowers the ability to uncover crimes, and it engenders impunity.

The low activity of the labor collectives and public organizations has weakened the prevention of lawbreaking, and it does not introduce proper order in the departmental territories of the ispolkoms [executive committees] of the local soviets of people's deputies.

In the adopted decree on this question, the Presidium of the BSSR Council of Ministers has admitted that the state of law and order in the republic is unsatisfactory. Mention is made of the inadequate work of the organs of internal affairs and justice, the ispolkoms of the local soviets, the ministries and departments, and the department of administrative organs of the Council of Ministers of the Belorussian SSR. They were required to undertake decisive measures to intensify the fight against crime, and to strengthen legality in the republic.

The meeting examined the question "Concerning the Work on Guaranteeing the Safekeeping of Explosives at Installations of the National Economy." It was noted that the real situation requires the introduction of proper order in accounting for, storing, and guarding explosives. Measures were outlined to limit the circle of organizations and persons who have a right to explosive work and to intensify security at dumps.

Progress in the construction of social security facilities in the republic and certain other questions were also examined. Appropriate decrees were adopted in this regard.

Campaign Against Organized Crime Discussed

90UN0504A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 50, 16-22 Dec 89 p 5

[Report on interview with former investigator V. Oleynik by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent S. Kredov: "...The Roots Were Left Untouched"; date and location not specified]

[Text] The issue of combating organized crime is point eight on the agenda of the Second Congress of People's Deputies. Today we publish an article which may be useful in considering this problem. ...The names of Tregubov, Sokolov, and other commercial employees from Moscow who ended up in the dock are gradually being forgotten. Many people associated with their departure hope for a better provisioning of the capital and the disappearance of various clans of "well-connected" clients. As can be seen, the results do not justify the hopes.

Our correspondent S. Kredov talked about this with V. Oleynik, who handled this issue for many years as an investigator.

[Kredov] Vladimir Ivanovich, somehow there has been no news about the trials of our other "providers" since Tregubov and his accomplices ended up behind bars. Is it that trade has stopped being a zone generating crime?

[Oleynik] Indeed, since the end of 1987 there have been virtually no criminal cases in Moscow involving bribery, organized defrauding of customers, and major theft, and not only in trade. They have begun looking the other way in such cases; the campaign has come to an end.

What are the results of proceeding in this manner? Recently I received a letter from the former director of a major grocery store in the capital city, a person I investigated, who is currently in exile. This year, he visited Moscow, met with his colleagues, and wrote this: "We were small fries compared to the present-day sharks. The 'charges' for appointments, allocation of assets, and advancement in the service have gone up. Some of the highly placed bribe takers have continued to move up..."

[Kredov] It is known that the investigative team which you headed revealed over 2,000 criminals among trade employees. However, did you manage to get to the roots?

[Oleynik] We did succeed in getting to the roots all right, but they did not let us really go at the roots. All connections between individuals under investigation by us and individual soviet and economic employees, party functionaries, and employees of law enforcement organs were cut off.

Indeed, Tregubov is "in the slammer." However, his appointment as the chief of the main administration was confirmed in high echelons. "Tregubism," and even reinforced Tregubism at that, exists to this day. We

encounter it every day. I assert with complete responsibility: There is every reason to carry on the artificially stopped investigation.

[Kredov] Between April and July of this year, you in your capacity as a deputy chief of the Department of Investigations of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Procuracy supervised compliance with the law in the course of investigating the case of Yakhyayev who later figured in the "Churbanov trial." How would you portray him?

[Oleynik] The role of the former minister of internal affairs of Uzbekistan in asserting the system of lawlessness has been underrated, to put it mildly. Look at all the attention Churbanov has been getting! Meanwhile, he is an inflated character who to some degree ended up at the top by chance. Indeed, he took bribes, but he did not torture people or confine them to "funny farms." Unlike Churbanov who was good for nothing as a specialist, Yakhyayev is a highly educated jurist, a militiaman. Incidentally there is an artistic streak in him.

In the mid-1970's a number of highly placed officials in Uzbekistan were convicted. At the time, many people thought that a noble endeavor had begun. It turns out that an unprincipled power struggle was underway. The people were framed as bribe-takers, drug addicts, corrupters of morals. The lowest provocations were practiced. For the most steadfast, medieval casemates were created where they taunted the victims. All of this dirty work was assigned to Yakhyayev. I am convinced that there are many innocent persons among those convicted. Meanwhile, just a few have been rehabilitated. Incidentally events developed along these lines in Krasnodar Kray, Azerbaijan, and Kazakhstan, as well as in Moscow. It is exactly thanks to such people as Yakhyayev that Rashidov's rule took hold. The criminal system owes less to Churbanov. I believe this is why they ended up differently...

[Kredov] You recently left the organs of the procuracy. Did you do it voluntarily?

[Oleynik] Voluntarily—after 30 years of working in the law enforcement organs. "In conjunction with my deteriorating health"—this is what I put on my request. This, however, is a diplomatic formula. I wrote my request in the evening of 7 July, after the Supreme Soviet confirmed the leadership of the USSR Procuracy. Now there is a lot of talk about ways to combat crime. However, a unified, purposeful policy is not apparent. As I see it, everything comes down to economic issues, and, as is known, a lot in this matter is still unclear. We are trying to get by using half-measures. I heard about hopes attached to wage increases. They have now added to the wages, and so what? The people are still leaving. The dream of combating crime, and especially its organized forms, will remain just a dream for as long as patronage and corruption remain, for as long as complete independence of both the investigator and the prosecutor from interference "from the top" is ensured, for as long as investigations remain departmental despite the decision of the First Congress of People's Deputies, for as long as "telephone law" exists.

Gorbachev, Other Leaders Sign Mazurov Obituary

PM2112120189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Obituary of Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov]

[Excerpt] Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the All-Union Council of Veterans of War and Labor, and personal pensioner of union status, died 19 December aged 75. [passage omitted]. [Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Ivashko, Ye.K. Ligachev, Yu.D. Maslyukov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.K. Pugo, G.P Razumovskiy, D.T. Yazov, O.D. Baklanov, A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, G.I. Usmanov, I.T. Frolov, R.N. Nishanov, S.A. Shalayev, A.D. Lizichev, N.V. Bosenko, Ye.Ye. Sokolov, N.I. Dementev, M.V. Kovalev, L.A. Voronin, V.T. Saykin, A.I. Golyakov, A.Ye. Andreyev, L.P. Lykova, V.G. Kulikov, A.P. Silantyev, and M.V. Zimyanin.

Funeral Commission Announced

PM2112115989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On the Formation of the Commission to Organize the Funeral of K.T. Mazurov"]

[Text] The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies has set up a commission to organize the funeral of USSR People's Deputy Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov with the following composition:

L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, commission chairman; A.I. Golyakov, first deputy chairman of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans; A.D. Lizichev, chief of the the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; V.N. Makeyev, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU]; R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; V.T. Saykin, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee.

Leningrad Communists' Election Plans Discussed

PM2112120889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent N. Volynskiy report under rubric "Toward Elections": "Power—Not in Order To Sit in Easy Chairs"]

[Text] Leningrad—Only 1 in 10 of the present Leningrad deputies on the republican and local soviets has decided to join the election contest....

Some—mainly party and economic cadres—are demoralized by the results of the 26 March elections, when the city and oblast leaders did not receive a vote of confidence. Others have gone to the other extreme. At a session of the city party committee [gorkom] bureau one rayon committee [raykom] secretary stated: "Our deputies are all going into battle, to a man!" But apparently the leadership was not pleased with this "shock work" approach. Gorkom Second Secretary S. Petrov shook his head dubiously: "'To a man'—is that necessary?"

After the bureau meeting, I had a discussion on this subject with the gorkom secretary. Sokrat Germanovich Petrov is one of those professional party workers who do not always show how busy they are. Many Leningraders know him. The gorkom second secretary's rating, as they call it, is fairly high, but not only because S. Petrov inspires trust and a sympathetic response. I have had the opportunity to observe him in all kinds of situations, sometimes very sensitive and difficult, and every time he remained true to himself: a well informed man, capable of quick decisions, who does not avoid difficult circumstances or sensitive issues.

[Volynskiy] "Why is it that we find, on the one hand, a more or less general refusal to participate in the elections, an avoidance of struggle, and on the other hand, boastful overconfidence?"

"Because," S. Petrov says, "until recent days the Leningrad Communists, first, had no common platform from which to appeal to the voters. And the new electoral situation really upsets some people, even annoys them: After all, hitherto they held their deputies' seats, so to speak, 'as of right.' But not now, brother—now you have to prove that you are worthy of the voters' confidence. The bureaucratic 'fast lane' to the organs of state power no longer exists, it is broken."

Indeed, when you meet with deputies whose term in office is expiring or with those who are prepared to go through the "purgatory" of elections, you have mixed feelings. Take the director of an institute or a large association. They still cannot understand—how can they manage without the title of deputy?! Until now the deputy's mandate has been attached to the job the same way the guarantee certificate is attached to a vacuum cleaner. That was the practice. And it is extremely difficult for these people—who are generally good economic managers, but by no means politicians—to abandon this stereotype. But is it really essential for all of them to sit on the soviet? And do we need that kind of soviet—a kind of "noble gathering" of administrators?

But take a factory party committee secretary—an energetic person not without a degree of healthy ambition, a deputy executive committee [ispolkom] chairman—with all the instincts of a political fighter, or an experienced gorkom member. Something else is worrying them today: the fear of possible failure. They know, of course, that if you are afraid of wolves you should not go into the forest. And more than once in their lives they have seen the operation of the unwritten rule—if you suffered just one failure in the party political field, it led almost inevitably to a chain reaction: dismissal from your post and sometimes complete failure in life.

This prejudice, the black-and-white principle on which it is customary to approach party members, is perhaps doing the greatest damage of all today. It is clearly time to abandon this superficial approach to a Communist's possible political failure. A contest is a contest and the loser in elections is not bankrupt yet.

Here I will venture an idea that is seditious by today's standards. I am convinced that a good apparatchik is worth his weight in gold, he is beyond price! He has that most valuable quality—of turning words and ideas into action. He knows the real state of affairs, he knows how to collect and evaluate information and make a decision. He is a professional. I have encountered many honest, intelligent, energetic people in the party and state apparatus. But their talents were not called upon, they were "frozen" by the administrative system. Will the new system call upon them? After all, they not only know what is required, they know how to turn a slogan into reality. Isn't the voter going too far by shrinking from the very word "apparatchik"? Clearly, it is necessary to think a hundred times before deciding whom to entrust with the fate of the rayon, city, or republic—simply a good man and a notable orator, or someone who cannot only inspire hopes, but fulfill them. And the Communists must explain this to people too.

True, no one is guaranteed against errors and mistakes in renewing the methods of party work in the course of active engagement in the election contest. A simple example: Until now, the independent organizations and newly emerged "parties" have had the monopoly of rallies and open campaigning in the city's squares. And where were the Communists? Were they shy? Were they ashamed to approach people? But that is, of course, entirely at odds with the idea of a party expressing the interests of the working person.

But then, not long ago, on Vasilyevskiy Island, the CPSU raykom summoned the Leningraders to the square. It was pouring rain. But several thousand people stayed at the rally which lasted an hour and a half. The Communists spoke about the problems of the city, the rayon, and the country; how to cure neglected social and spiritual ills; and questions of intraparty democracy. It was only a pity that many of the speakers evaded topical election matters and saw the panacea for all ills only in the convening of an extraordinary CPSU congress, as if it alone could impose order in the rayon, in the courtyards, on the streets, in the stores, in the parks....

Also, this trend was not avoided at the city party rally, which took place immediately after the joint obkom and gorkom plenum where the election platform was adopted. The speeches of certain ultraradical participants evoked mixed reactions in Leningraders. But after all, a rally is a rally.

But then, a few days later, the platform was published. And that is a document; it sets forth a stance, not a word of it can be unsaid. And it transpires that the Leningrad party members' position is highly radical and sweeps aside attempts to assert that they are moving "to the right." This was confirmed, incidentally, by a second city-wide rally, whose participants, primarily CPSU members, expressed firm support for the CPSU Central Committee Politburo's course of radical reforms.

But let us come back to the election platform.

This is the first experience for a long time in preparing such an important document, and there is no tradition. And the document undoubtedly should and will be elaborated every day. In fact, in principle the election platform's formula is simple: This is what needs to be done, esteemed voters, in our view, to make your lives better. Trust us, give us power, so that our ideas acquire the force of state decisions.

Whereas the platform outlines fundamental, cardinal positions and trends, in the course of the election campaign it will be necessary to concentrate on resolving concrete, "tricky" questions that concern the Leningraders. For instance, when will the disgraceful ration coupons for goods be abolished, what will happen in the housing sphere by the year 2000, will the quality of water and air change for the better, how and when will the food problem be resolved? Instead of concrete answers to this last question, in particular, the voter learns from, for instance, Yu. Yarov, member of the party obkom bureau and chairman of the oblast soviet ispolkom, that Leningrad can supply only 30% of its own food products, and he does not believe that figure. And he is right. Because he remembers the following "trivial" point—about half of the vegetables grown in the oblast rot. And he also recalls that labor productivity in agriculture is at least 10 times lower than it should and could be in our oblast. Will the same old oblast agro-industrial association continue to exist? When will the state farm [sovkhoz] or farmer feel that they are the masters, so that they can become real breadwinners? As yet there is no answer to these questions.

"There will be," Sokrat Germanovich asserts. "The platform is a policy document, covering general questions. We will also tell the voters, without fail, specifically what the Communists are willing and able to do for the city and its good, if they put their trust in us."

But even before the adoption of the general platform, the rayon party organizations understood the need for concrete dialogue with the voters. At Kalininskiy CPSU Raykom, for instance, they adopted a businesslike tone. If we receive seats, the Communists here say, in our term as deputies we will transfer the vegetable depot, the rayon food stores, and public catering enterprises to the lease system... We will build a collective farm [kolkhoz] market, open a network of new stores, general clinics, physical culture and fitness centers—all in the same concrete spirit, giving clear details and names. Soon the election platform of Moskovskiy Rayon CPSU organization appeared in the newspaper VECHERNIY LENINGRAD—and it too was practical and businesslike.

"We are not promising anything excessive or unrealistic," raykom First Secretary A. Aleksandrov says. "We do not need power so that we can sit in easy chairs. The party started perestroyka, and it is its guarantor in practice."

It is characteristic that the majority of Communists—rank-and-file and leaders—have vigorously rejected the principle of production okrugs. They said so in the platform, thereby putting an end to the attempts to pass off this idea as an initiative put forward by the whole of Leningrad or as the "machinations" of the apparatus. Leningrad Soviet deputies have also declared elections based on the workplace to be undemocratic.

Leningrad has consequently abandoned this idea. The elections will take place exclusively on the basis of territorial okrugs. And that required a fundamental restructuring of party work in the present campaign. Take Kalininskiy Rayon again. Only one in seven of the okrug's voters works here. The other six work elsewhere. So the raykom decided to regroup its forces rapidly and start campaigning and organizational work at places of residence. To begin with, they have set up ad hoc party organizations in housing districts and elected secretaries, releasing them from their duties where they are registered.

And one can already say that this is a correct, very promising move. Especially if you take into account that by comparison with certain other social associations, party organizations still have more discipline and mobility. Nonetheless, it is hard to make any predictions. Especially against the background of public opinion that is as sensitive as a raw nerve. It takes note of everything. Nothing escapes its attention. Neither concrete steps toward people. Nor attempts, sometimes unconscious, to whip up the social atmosphere, justify one's own blunders and sluggishness in terms of the "intrigues" of informals or the press, and even "blame" the ineffectiveness of one's on work onto the center, for instance onto the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo.

One thing may be said confidently: There is no time for such "clarifications of relations." The election train has already moved off.

Glavlit Chief Discusses Draft Press Law

90US0182A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 45, 11-17 Nov 89 pp 4-5

[Report on interview with the chief of the USSR Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press, Glavlit, V. Boldyrev, by unidentified ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent: "State Secrets and Glasnost"; date and place not specified]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet will consider the "Law on the Press and Other Mass Media" in its first reading very soon. As is known, as early as 27 October 1917 the Council of People's Commissars adopted decrees on the press which, among other things, included an obligation to pass a law on the freedom of the press. In the 72nd year of Soviet power, the deputies will receive an opportunity to carry out Lenin's instructions.

People's deputies, lawyers, and journalists have discussed the law, its main content and thrust in the press. Today an ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent is conducting an interview on this topic with the head of yet another "concerned" organization, the chief of the USSR Glavlit [Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press], V. Boldyrev.

[Correspondent] What is your attitude toward the draft law on the press?

[Boldyrev] Favorable on the whole. As I see it, the main point is that it codifies freedom of information in our country through legislation. The role of the media is extremely great, especially now that we are having "a revolution within a revolution." The press is not only a vigorous engine of perestroyka, but also a forum for discussions. On the scale of the entire international community, freedom of information is inseparable from respect for the dignity of every person, the defense of his main rights.

[Correspondent] How is this response to be reconciled with your statement during the discussion of the draft law in the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet in which, according to press reports, you objected to the elimination of censorship?

[Boldyrev] I will try to shed some light on this issue. The employees of our organization are in favor of the expansion of glasnost in the press and unhindered and free expression of any opinion and view by the citizens of our country in its pages, to be sure, except for calls for a violent overthrow or change in the existing state and social system, propaganda of war, racial, national, and religious exclusivity or intolerance, and dissemination of pornography. In other words, all of us are against political and ideological censorship.

At the same time, the draft law does not envisage a mechanism for safeguarding state, military, commercial, and other secrets protected by law in the course of open publication. This may bring about damage to the defense interests of our state, leaks of extremely important scientific-technical and economic information abroad, and, finally, considerable financial losses due to the premature publication of data on new technologies and projects. It is exactly preventing the appearance of such information in the press and other mass media that is the task of the USSR Glavlit and its local organs, in particular, in the course of preliminary monitoring of a certain segment of publications (incidentally, a substantial layer of print and TV and radio media is not monitored by us).

The draft says that the editor (editor in chief) is responsible for the information disseminated meeting the requirements of the law; the journalist notifies the editor of the limits beyond which the information disseminated may represent divulging state secrets or other secrets specifically protected by law. First, this provision is illogical because there should not be data constituting state secrets in the material. Second, it obligates the editor and the journalist to have perfect expertise with regard to many problems associated with the protection of state secrets, to what is and is not a secret, which indirect data may help divulge a secret in the information prepared and under which conditions. I believe it is unrealistic to obtain this on the part of the press employees mentioned, not only immediately after the adoption of the law, but even in the remote future. Therefore, either "editorial" censorship unjustified by the needs of safeguarding state and other secrets will be practiced extensively for the purpose of self-defense, or state secrets will be divulged, which will be even more dangerous.

[Correspondent] However, the draft envisages sanctions against publications and officials for violating the provisions of the law. Will this not be a reliable barrier to divulging secrets?

[Boldyrev] This represents follow-up, or "punitive" censorship which, as is known, exists in virtually all countries. However, should we emulate everything blindly? Court proceedings will hardly make things more democratic for us. The main point is that the editor and the author will suffer, but the state will suffer at the same time because secret information will have already been published and no ruling of the court or the prosecutor will be able "to make it secret again" all the more so if it finds its way into such real-time mass media as newspapers, TV or radio broadcasts. Also, the current condition of our court system calls into doubt the practicability of complying with Article 25 of the draft law.

[Correspondent] We are referring here to the editor, the journalist. After all, they receive information from ministries, offices, organizations, and the officials in them. Should they not display concern for safeguarding their secrets?

[Boldyrev] As many years of our practice show, the holders of secrets at times are not sufficiently aware of the confines of what is admissible for release, especially in related fields, in particular, in the contact zones of sciences, in jointly developed scientific, technical, and other projects. Substantial shortcomings occur in the system of security and secrecy maintenance. Likewise, we are "trailing" foreign countries badly in the organization of and, putting it bluntly, the skill of safeguarding "company" secrets reliably and reasonably. This may be the primary reason why the organs of our system remove many thousands of pieces of classified data annually in our country as a whole. In their entirety, they constitute

top secret scientific-technical, defense, and purely military materials and information, materials and "know-how" on the most modern technologies. Naturally, I cannot give specific examples. However, in the recent period alone the publication of a number of most important data constituting military and even state secrets in the central press has been prevented in keeping with our remarks. Their publication could have resulted in quite considerable losses to the state and could have damaged the interests of our country.

All of this has happened despite the ministries, offices, and publishing organizations having catalogs of data whose publication is forbidden. [Correspondent] Perhaps an arrangement for protecting state secrets should be outlined in the Law on State Secrets rather than the Law on the Press.

[Boldyrev] As I see it, all three laws—on the press, on glasnost, and on state secrets—should be considered and passed in a single package.

However, since the Law on the Press is the first to be discussed, we should envisage in it a mechanism for safeguarding state and other secrets in the event of open publication, at least in the most general form.

[Correspondent] Do you have specific suggestions?

[Boldyrev] A point with, for example, this content should be added to the draft: "The safeguarding of state secrets in the press and other mass media is entrusted to a special government organ operating pursuant to the legislation in effect in the country and in the manner determined by the USSR Council of Ministers."

[Correspondent] What guarantee is there that we would not go back to infamous "political censorship" in this case?

[Boldyrev] The guarantee is in the Law on the Press and Other Mass Media itself which restricts the actions of the staff of this government organ to safeguarding state secrets alone. We are creating a law-governed state. Consequently, nobody will be allowed to violate the law.

[Correspondent] Does the amendment proposed constitute a violation of international documents on compliance with human rights and the freedom to disseminate information?

[Boldyrev] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international pacts on human rights, the Final Document of the Vienna meeting of representatives of states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and a number of other international agreements include recommendations on the free exchange of information, the right of the citizen of any country to freely state his opinion, and freedom of conscience. At the same time, they stress or do not deny that the exercise of these freedoms may be restricted due to compliance with certain conditions which are necessary in a democratic society in the interest of national or social security.

[Correspondent] How are such issues resolved in other countries?

[Boldyrev] Let us look, for example, at a "country of classical democracy" such as England, a party to the international agreements mentioned. A wide array of various forms of control exists in that country. First of all, there is the Committee for Safeguarding Military Secrets in the Mass Media, the so-called "D" Committee. It publishes a list of data which, if leaked, may damage the interests of national security and whose publication has to be cleared by this committee.

Other methods of control are also used in Great Britain. "The Official Secrets Act" forbids divulging information on the operation of the government by any office holder or official without authorization. Data of a military nature, as well as other data, including agriculture, medical statistics, and so on, are considered to constitute such information.

If we add to this the existence of strictest "company-wide" control in all economically developed countries and monitoring by international organizations of the COCOM [Coordinating Committee of East-West Trade Policy] type, a well-tuned multi-layer system of safeguarding secrets emerges.

There is no such system in our country. Under these circumstances, it would be advisable to provide a reliable legal foundation for the government organ ensuring the safeguarding of secret information in the press and other mass media.

Restoration of Exiles' Citizenship Urged

PM111208558 9 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with A. Yeliseyev, chairman of the Deputies' Commission for Citizenship Questions, by G. Alimov under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Giving Back Citizenship", date, place of interview not given; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] As already reported, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has officially recognized that in the 1970's and 1980's a number of our citizens were groundlessly deprived of Soviet citizenship. The Presidium deemed it expedient to take steps to give them back their rights if these people express the wish to regain Soviet citizenship.

The fundamental decision adopted recently somehow went by unnoticed, and was lost against the background of the daily fast moving events in which the present abounds. But this does not in the least diminish its significance.

A. Yeliseyev, chairman of the Deputies' Commission for Citizenship Questions set up under the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium after the First Congress of People's Deputies, said in conversation with your correspondent that the preliminary examination of these applications

and the preparation of corresponding proposals on giving back Soviet citizenship are entrusted to the commission headed by him.

[Yeliseyev] We get many applications from the country's various creative organizations about giving back Soviet citizenship to certain former compatriots. We would be prepared to reach a positive conclusion on some of them tomorrow if we had a personal application from the actual people who suffered.

[Alimov] But when their citizenship was taken away, they weren't asked their opinion, they didn't submit applications!

[Yeliseyev] This was terribly unfair. So now some people are proposing the annulment of all those decrees at once. But it would be equally unfair to give people their citizenship back without asking for their consent. Can they accept it once again, will they want it?

[Alimov] We are talking about a number of people groundlessly deprived of their citizenship. One can only guess at who in particular. Does this assessment extend to, for example, Solzhenitsyn, Vishnevskaya, Rostropovich?..

[Yeliseyev] Yes. Of course, it is impossible to list everyone. They were deprived of their citizenship in connection with leaving the country and statements which discredited the great name of Soviet citizen and harmed the country's prestige. In 2 decades 175 people came under this formula. Of course, it cannot be said that they were all deprived of citizenship groundlessly.

[Alimov] Has your commission set up contacts with those who, it is generally recognized, were treated unfairly?

[Yeliseyev] Yes. Such contacts exist.

[Alimov] Will those who are given back their Soviet citizenship have to return to the motherland?

[Yeliseyev] It is time for us to reject past prejudices. It is not at all mandatory to live in your country to keep your citizenship. The world treats this much more simply; this question simply does not arise. For example, the well-known writer Graham Greene has not stopped being a British subject, although he has been living in France for the last 10 years. We must also strive toward these civilized norms.

Of course, like many others, I would like them to be with us at home once again. The spiritual place they occupied here cannot be filled by anyone else. The country needs them very much. So I am at one with Nikolay Gubenko, the new minister of culture, who said he considers assisting the return to the country of its prominent cultural and artistic figures as one of his top tasks.

Yevgeniy Ambartsumov Writes on Sakharov's Death

PM2112125689 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 18 Dec 89 p 1

[Article by Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, political scientist and economist: "The Strength of An Example"]

[Text] Sakharov's death is a grave loss to the entire world, and above all to the Soviet Union. He was a great scientist: Despite the lies of the Brezhnev press, according to which he abandoned scientific research (I am citing the Soviet Encyclopedia of the time), even in his final years of very intense social activity he made important discoveries in the field of theoretical physics.

He was rightly considered the inventor of the Soviet hydrogen bomb. But, unlike his U.S. counterpart, Teller, he was not proud of it, and in fact managed to relinquish his brilliant career as a "child prodigy" of the Soviet state to become an "enfant terrible." He sided against the military industrial complex and, still more resolutely, against nuclear tests—in fact, against the nuclear bomb. He foresaw the threat of the annihilation of mankind from the uncontrolled development of technical and scientific progress and the arms race. He became a prophet and thus suffered the fate of a prophet. The rage of those in power increased when Sakharov began his uninterrupted defense of oppressed peoples and individuals. He was subjected to illegal exile and restraint, including physical restraint. His physical weakening and premature death are the results of this. But he was the victor in the unequal struggle with the strongest state in modern times.

However, Sakharov's aim was not victory, but the transformation of this state and of our society. We now realize that Sakharov's unyielding struggle made a considerable contribution to Gorbachev's accession to power. Recently some people have decided to place excessive emphasis on the disputes between them, but let us not forget that it was Gorbachev himself that had him brought back from exile and returned him to active political life. I therefore believe in the sincerity of the grief expressed by Gorbachev, who made a point of stressing his human integrity. He will certainly miss this great opponent and interlocutor.

Their aim was the same; their methods differed. While supporting perestroyka and glasnost, Sakharov was never satisfied with the progress, visible but slow. He wanted a rapid transformation of our country into a genuine democracy. For a politician this "haste" was not a realistic objective, but Sakharov could not act otherwise. He was not suited to the compromises on which politics thrives. He had great courage, however. It is impossible to forget how, during the first session of the Congress of People's Deputies, he stood up to that hostile and noisy assembly, as he launched his invectives against the invasion of Afghanistan. I hope that his opponents now acknowledge that he was right.

A great moralist, he continued the traditions of the Russian intelligentsia and culture. The moral standard that he set was unattainable, but always served us as a model of conduct and human dignity. He leaves a gap impossible to fill, but his example gives us the strength to combat the threats and obstacles that will inevitably occur on the road of perestroyka and the transformation of our society into a more civilized and human one.